

# RCV Portal

Budget year: FY2008  
Agency: 200

This Exhibit was submitted on Apr 14, 2009 11:30:37 AM by GREGG ALDANA.

---

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

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

---

### Section A: Overview

1. Date of submission: **Feb 25, 2009**
2. Agency: **200**
3. Bureau: **45**
4. Name of this Capital Asset: **RCV Portal**
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **200-45-01-02-01-0001-00**
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2010? **Full-Acquisition**
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? **FY2008**
8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap: **The Selective Service System's Registration, Registration Maintenance, Registration Compliance, Registration Verification and Health Care Personnel Delivery System applications and data are currently hosted in an IBM z/OS mainframe environment designed and set-up in the late 1980s/early 1990s. SSS seeks to secure a vendor(s) to lead and execute a complete project (from planning through implementation) to redesign all of its existing mainframe applications and migrate all of its mainframe data from a COBOL, CICS, batch JCL, VSAM and SAS SYSTEM 2000 computing environment to an environment in alignment with the standards profile the agency's Enterprise Architecture. As part of the Selective Service System's technology standards profile in its Enterprise Architecture, the Microsoft development platform has been standardized across the agency for all future software development efforts. The purpose of this rewrite/migration will be to decrease operating and maintenance costs, ensure system compliance with all Federal Security (FISMA, NIST, etc.) and Information Technology requirements (Clinger Cohen Act, Paperwork Reduction Act, etc.), increase technical capabilities of the applications and allow seamless integration with the other systems/data**

throughout the agency's Enterprise Architecture. Secondly the SSS would like to reduce its ongoing recurring costs to operate/support the mainframe and the cost of increased or standby capacity. In addition, SSS is now being required by the White House (OMB Memorandum M-06-16) to incorporate more stringent security measures into their systems to protect access to sensitive data. SSS is seeking a vendor that is knowledgeable and has specific experience in building information systems in alignment with the Selective Service System's Enterprise Architecture Standards Profile that comply with all Federal Security and Information Technology mandates.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? **Aug 1, 2006**
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? **yes**
11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?
  - Name **Gregg Aldana**
  - Phone Number **703-605-4079**
  - E-mail **gregg.aldana@sss.gov**
  - a. What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the program/project manager? **Senior/Expert/DAWIA-Level 3**
  - b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned? **Aug 1, 2006**
  - c. What date did the Program/Project Manager receive the FAC-P/PM certification? If the certification has not been issued, what is the anticipated date for certification? **Aug 1, 2006**
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)? **no**
  - b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) [Not answered]
    1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? [Not answered]
    2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? [Not answered]
    3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? [Not answered]
13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? **yes**  
**Expanded E-Government**
  - a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? **he new system will be migrating off of the legacy mainframe environment to a modern Windows Environment. All applications will be browser based and enable SSS to offer all pre mobilization and post Mobilization functions through the Internet. The new platform will also allow SSS to interface with other government entities to exchange information via secured web services for standard interfaces and rapid turnaround on processing of information requests.**
14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit [www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part).) **no**
  - a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? [Not answered]
  - b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? [Not answered]
  - c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? [Not answered]
15. Is this investment for information technology? **yes**



Number of FTE represented by Costs:	32	18	18	9	9	4	4	4	98
-------------------------------------	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	----

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? **yes**
  - a. If "yes", How many and in what year? **1 or 2 in 2010 or 2011.**
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: **The original amount the contract was awarded to was increased by 65,362.47 due to an increase in size of disclosed legacy source code. In addition the estimated Government FTE costs were \$205,643 less than originally estimated. A plus up of \$2M was requested for FY2010 to accelerate the project due to our hosting provider USMEPCOM indicating they are migrating their systems off of the shared mainframe environment by September 2010.**

### Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

1.

<b>Contracts/Task Orders Table:</b>	
Contract or Task Order Number	SSS-C-20006-003
Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	GWAC Stars 8a
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Sep 30, 2006
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2006
End date of Contract/Task Order	Apr 30, 2007
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	0.648
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	no
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	yes
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Calvin Montgomery
CO Contact information (phone/email)	(703) 605-4038 / calvin.montgomery@sss.gov
Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level	1
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	yes
Contract or Task Order Number	SSS-C-20007-003
Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	GSA Schedule
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Aug 22, 2007
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 1, 2007
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 1, 2009
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	0.987
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	yes

Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Calvin Montgomery
CO Contact information (phone/email)	(703) 605-4038 / calvin.montgomery@sss.gov
Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level	1
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	yes

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: [Not answered]
3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **yes**
  - a. Explain why not or how this is being done? **The contract contains a requirement that all software produced by vendor must be 508 compliant.**
4. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," what is the date? **Jun 11, 2006**
    1. Is it Current? **yes**
  - b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? [Not answered]
    1. If "no," briefly explain why: [Not answered]

#### Section D: Performance Information

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2010	Goal 1: Ensure preparedness and the capacity to timely provide manpower to DoD during and national emergency.	Technology	System Development	This effort will be measured and evaluated in terms of annual operation cost savings of registration information systems.	The current annual operating costs of the registration information systems (not including FTE) exceed \$400,000 annually.	90% reduction.	[Not answered]
2010	Goal 1: Ensure preparedness and the capacity to timely provide manpower to DoD during and national emergency.	Processes and Activities	System Development	This effort will be measured and evaluated in terms of annual operation cost savings of registration information systems.	The current annual operating costs of the registration information systems (not including FTE) exceed \$400,000 annually.	90% reduction.	[Not answered]
2010	Goal 1: Ensure preparedness and the capacity to timely provide manpower to DoD during and national emergency.	Customer Results	System Development	This effort will be measured and evaluated in terms of annual operation cost savings of registration information systems.	The current annual operating costs of the registration information systems (not including FTE) exceed \$400,000 annually.	90% reduction.	[Not answered]
	Goal 1: Ensure			This effort will be	The current annual operating		

2010	preparedness and the capacity to timely provide manpower to DoD during and national emergency.	Mission and Business Results	System Development	measured and evaluated in terms of annual operation cost savings of registration information systems.	costs of the registration information systems (not including FTE) exceed \$400,000 annually.	90% reduction.	[Not answered]
------	--	------------------------------	--------------------	---	--	----------------	----------------

**Section E: Security and Privacy**

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment?: **yes**
  - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: **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 and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned certification and accreditation (C&A) update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
RCV Portal	Government Only	Dec 31, 2010	Nov 30, 2010

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37?	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
<i>There are no Operational Systems.</i>							

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, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness. [Not answered]
7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? [Not answered]

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?	Internet Link or Explanation	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Internet Link or Explanation
RCV Portal	yes	yes	This system is replacing an operational Mainframe system that has a PIA available upon	yes	<a href="http://www.sss.gov/PRIVACY.HTM">http://www.sss.gov/PRIVACY.HTM</a>

		request.	
--	--	----------	--

**Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)**

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? **yes**
  - a. If "no," please explain why? [Not answered]
  
2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. **RCV Portal**
  - b. If "no," please explain why? [Not answered]
  
3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>. **881-000**

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table :							
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	Service Component Reused		Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
				Component Name	UPI		
<i>There are no Service Components.</i>							

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
<i>There are no mappings to Technical Reference Models.</i>				

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

---

**Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information**

---

**Section A: Alternatives Analysis**

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this investment? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? **Aug 15, 2006**
  - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? [Not answered]
  - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: [Not answered]

2. Alternatives Analysis Results:			
		Risk	Risk

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Microsoft.net SQL Server Solution	This alternative employs a strategy of redesigning/rewriting CICS/COBOL online/batch code as object oriented .NET real-time applications and redesigning/rewriting the inefficient manual batch JCL/COBOL applications to automated native Microsoft applications that process data in real-time from an open and scalable SQL Server relational database. Projected to take 12 months to implement and cost \$2,000,000. Provide a complete ROI on the investment within 6 years.	6267030	0
Java Oracle Solution	This alternative employs a strategy of redesigning/rewriting CICS/COBOL online/batch code as object oriented JSP real-time applications and redesigning/rewriting the inefficient manual batch JCL/COBOL applications to automated native Oracle/JAVA based applications that process data in real-time in an open and scalable Oracle relational database. Projected to take 24 months to implement and cost \$3,127,000. Provide a complete ROI within 11 years.	7632000	0
Fujitsu Software Microsoft.net SQL Server Solution	This alternative employs a two phased strategy of first using Proprietary Fujitsu Software (NetCOBOL/NeoKicks) that would run the CICS/COBOL online/batch code and the inefficient manual batch JCL/COBOL applications "as is" on the Microsoft platform. The second phase would consist of the migration outlined in the first alternative above. Projected to take 18 months to implement and cost \$2,415,600. Provide a complete ROI within 8 years.	6537820	0

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **Clearly the best suited alternative for the SSS environment was the Microsoft.net/SQL Server solution. In addition to the shortest return on investment, it provided the SSS with the proper technical solution. Given the type of processing applications SSS has (data processing vs. ecommerce intensive), given the technical staff set currently available at SSS (COBOL and dataflex developers) and given the limited IT capital spending available to SSS, this solution was ideally matched for our environment. The Microsoft development tools and platform are well suited for environment's that require building data intensive web applications in a rapid manner with limited costs and require a rapid learning curve for legacy developers. This standard has been set for the IT Directorate for all future software development efforts. The new development platform is also outlined in the agency's Standards Profile as required by OMB in the Agency's Enterprise Architecture Document. The selected alternative will provide a new system, with real-time processing capabilities, will virtually eliminate all of the manual staff interaction previously required to process data. The new system will be robust and able to scale up or down, as the Agency's needs dictate. The new solution will be designed and developed to meet all Federal Information Technology Requirements (Clinger Cohen Act, Paperwork Reduction Act, etc.) and allow for the seamless integration of all stringent security measures for protecting and tracking access to sensitive information that meet the current (OMB Memorandum M-06-16) as well as future federal mandates for the Agency. The migration from the mainframe to a Microsoft-based platform will dramatically reduce SSS's operating costs by 90% to less than \$50K annually**
- a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, when the budgeted costs savings exceeded the cumulative costs.) **2012**
4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **Provide a significant cost reduction of operating costs of production environment (from \$400,000 to less than \$50,000 annually) o Provide a highly scalable architecture where it is much less expensive to add resources should the need arise to significantly increase the processing capacity of the DMC. o Provide a system built on a Platform technology capable of meeting all current and future Federal Security Mandates (OMB, FISMA, NIST, etc) for Protecting and Tracking Access to Sensitive Data. o Provide a new system that ensures compliance with all federal information technology requirements (Clinger Cohen Act, Paperwork Reduction Act, etc.) o Provide significant performance enhancements over current mainframe system. o Provide superior production monitoring and ABEND handling environment. o Provide a superior and agile development environment allowing faster turnaround for changes in shorter elapsed time for new development. o**



Provide a modern system where all data and source code is baselined and changes/modifications can be tracked easily.

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits (\$millions):				
	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY-1 and Prior				
PY				
CY				
BY				
BY+1				
BY+2				
BY+3				
BY+4 and Beyond	0	0	[Not answered]	[Not answered]
Total LCC Benefit	0	0	LCC = Life-cycle cost	

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

- 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? **This Investment**
- If "yes," please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment or Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
RIMS/HCPDS	[Not answered]	Dec 31, 2010

#### Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

- Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? **yes**
  - If "yes," what is the date of the plan? **Aug 22, 2006**
  - Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? **no**
  - If "yes," describe any significant changes: [Not answered]
- If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? [Not answered]
  - If "yes," what is the planned completion date? [Not answered]
  - If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? [Not answered]
- Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: **Mitigation Plans that have been identified in the Risk Assessment have lead to specific task/action plans and requirements being included in this project in order to both monitor and address all risk identified proactively.**

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

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

2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than  $\pm 10\%$ ? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) **yes**
- If "yes," was it the? **Both**
  - If "yes," explain the causes of the variance: **The variance was caused by the contractor dramatically underestimating the size of the effort as well as not being to deliver acceptable deliverables in a timely manner.**
  - If "yes," describe the corrective actions **The contractor has replaced key staff members on the project and re-baselined/submitted a new project plan for the effort to SSS for approval. This new plan adds an additional year to the project. Since the project is a firm fixed price project, no additional cost for this effort will be incurred by the government.**
3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? **yes**
- If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? **May 30, 2008**

**4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:**

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned:Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned:Actual		Schedule:Cost (# days:\$M)		
Revised Project Plan and Earned Value Tracking Projections for Phase#1	Oct 22, 2007	0.035815	Oct 22, 2007	Oct 22, 2007	0.035815	0.035815	0	0	100
Current Systems Analysis Documentation	May 23, 2008	0.243187	Jan 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.533598	[Not answered]	217	0.290411	70
Concept of Operations Document	Jun 27, 2008	0.077258	Feb 20, 2009	[Not answered]	0.031632	[Not answered]	223	-0.045626	75
Detailed Requirements Document	Sep 5, 2008	0.460094	Aug 28, 2009	[Not answered]	0.231931	[Not answered]	325	-0.228163	0
Training/Staffing Recommendations	Sep 5, 2008	0.001438	Aug 28, 2009	[Not answered]	0.005652	[Not answered]	325	0.004214	0
Project Plan and Earned Value Tracking Projections for Phase#2	Sep 19, 2008	0.065972	Aug 28, 2009	[Not answered]	0.045136	[Not answered]	344	-0.020836	0
Detailed Design, Coding, Testing and Deployment of RCV Portal.	Dec 31, 2010	2	Dec 31, 2010	[Not answered]	2	[Not answered]	0	0	0