INITIATIVE DEFINITION BY08

Initiative Definition BY08

Template Name	IT Investment BY2008
Investment Name	REAC - 307870 - Physical Assessment Sub-System
Investment Revision Number	7
Is this investment a consolidated business case?	No
Point of Contact	ECPIC, Admin
Revision Comment	
Class	IT

I.A: OVERVIEW BY08

Descriptive Information BY08

Date of Submission	9/11/2006
Agency	Department of Housing and Urban Development
Bureau	Working Capital Fund
Name of this Capital Asset	REAC - 307870 - Physical Assessment Sub-System
Full UPI Code	025-00-01-03-01-1110-00
Four Digit UPI Code	1110
Two Digit UPI Code	00
Exhibit 53 Part	IT Investments by Mission Area
OMB Investment Type	01 - Major Investment
OMB Exhibit 53 Major Mission Area	03 - Rental Housing Assistance
PY Full UPI Code	025-00-01-03-01-1010-00-301-093
What kind of investment will this be in this Budget Year?	Mixed Life Cycle
If this investment supports homeland security, Indicate by corresponding number which homeland security mission area(s) this investment supports?	
OMB Short Description	The Physical Assessment Subsystem collects data and reports the actual state of repair and habitability on properties in the HUD portfolio. 2.3M in FY 07 will be used to redesign the system. 2.3M in FY08 will be used to complete the redesign phase.
Investment C&A Status	55 - All of the systems within this investment have been through a C&A Process and have been granted Full Authority to Operate

Screening Questions BY08

What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2002

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:

PURPOSE: Continuing investment in PASS will support business process and information technology modernization in accordance with HUD's Rental Housing Assistance (RHA) Line of Business (LOB) segment architecture and the Department's Business and IT Modernization Roadmap (Vision 2010). Public and Indian Housing's Real Estate Assessment Center (PIH-REAC) is charged with the responsibility to centralize and standardize the way HUD evaluates the condition of the over 3,000 Public Housing Authorities (PHA's) and over 30,000 Federal Housing Administration (FHA) multifamily insured, direct loan, HUD-held, and Section 8 project-based subsidized properties (subsequently referred to as PHA's and Housing properties). PIH-REAC is designed to give the Department a comprehensive and consistent vehicle for portfolio oversight to prioritize and direct its resources to PHA's and Housing properties. The Physical Assessment Subsystem (PASS) is the cornerstone to PIH-REAC's property evaluation process for physical inspections of HUD's housing portfolio. HUD's investment in developing PASS ties directly back to the Department's APP and its principal objective to help restore the public trust, increase affordable housing and reduce homelessness. In the long term, the investment in PASS is expected to reduce reporting costs for program participants and help simplify HUD's monitoring procedures.

The Physical Assessment Subsystem (PASS) has two key objectives:

1) To collect profile data for all PHA and Housing properties for which HUD has a statutory obligation or a financial interest.

2) To physically inspect these properties and provide the capability to assess their condition based upon

"decent, safe and sanitary conditions in a good state of repair".

The Physical Assessment Subsystem collects data and reports the actual state of repair and habitability on properties in the HUD portfolio.
2.3M in FY 07 will be used to redesign the system.
2.3M in FY08 will be used to complete the redesign phase.

Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	8/15/2006
Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes
Contact information of Project Manager?	
Project Manager Name Doshi, Hitesh	
Project Manager Phone Number	202-475-8940
Project Manager E-mail	hitesh_a._doshi@hud.gov
Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.	Yes
Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	Yes
Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	No
If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	No
If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	No
If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives?	Yes
If "yes," check all of the PMA initiatives that apply:	Housing and Urban Development Management and Performance
Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)	No
Does this investment address a weakness found during the PART Review?	No
If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?	
If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?	
Is this investment for information technology?	Yes
Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?	The PASS initiative directly supports 3 of the Government-wide PMA Goals. #2 Competitive Sourcing is accomplished through the implementation of the Reverse Auction. #4 Expanded Electronic government is accomplished by providing an automated solution for the very complicated physical inspection process. #5 Budget and Performance Integration is accomplished by reducing the cost of inspections through competition and increasing accuracyof physical assessment reporting.

IT Screening Questions BY08

If the answer to Question: "Is this investment for information technology?" was "Yes," complete this sub-section. If the answer is "No," do not answer this sub-section.	
What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	Level 3
What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council's PM Guidance):	(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's 'high risk" memo)?	No
Is this a financial management system?	No

If "yes", does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	No	
If "yes," which FFMIA compliance area?	n/a	
If "no," what does it address?		
If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52		
Provide the Percentage Financial Management for the budget year	0.940000	
What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)	100.000000	
For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for hardware?	0.800000	
For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for software?	0.800000	
For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for services?	98.400000	
For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for other services?	0	
If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?	No	
Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:		
Privacy Officer Name Smith, Jeanette		
Privacy Officer Phone Number	202-708-2374	
Privacy Officer Title	Departmental Privacy Act Officer	
Privacy Officer E-mail	Jeanette_smith@HUD.gov	
Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	No	

I.B: SUMMARY OF SPENDING BY08

Summary of Spending BY08

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

SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT STAGES   * Costs in thousands

	PY - 1 and Earlier	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 and Beyond	Total
Planning									
Budgetary Resources	6548.706	643.837	1012.5	636.7					
Outlays	6548.706	0	0	0					
A. Project Initiation/Planning									
Budgetary Resources	1048.706	71.537	112.5	70.1					
Outlays	1048.706	0	0	0					
B. Requirements Definition									
Budgetary	2750	286.15	450	283.3					

	PY - 1 and Earlier	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 and Beyond	Total
Resources									
Outlays	2750	0	0	0					
C. System Design									
Budgetary Resources	2750	286.15	450	283.3					
Outlays	2750	0	0	0					
Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	7890.859	786.914	1237.5	778.9					
Outlays	7890.859	0	0	0					
D. Software Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	310	37.019	67.5	35.4					
Outlays	310	0	0	0					
E. Hardware/Infrastructure Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	310	37.019	45	35.4					
Outlays	310	0	0	0					
F. New Development/Perfective Maintenance									
Budgetary Resources	3900.859	416.725	607.5	424.9					
Outlays	3900.859	0	0	0					
G. Systems Integration & Testing									
Budgetary Resources	1860	222.113	450	212.4					
Outlays	1860	0	0	0					
H. Installation & Deployment									
Budgetary Resources	1510	74.038	67.5	70.8					
Outlays	1510	0	0	0					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	14439.565	1430.751	2250	1415.6					
Outlays	14439.565	0	0	0					
Operations & Maintenance									
Budgetary Resources	4053.191	1250	1300	1093.3					
Outlays	4053.191	0	0	0					
I. Systems Operation									
Budgetary Resources	1108.079	500	650	437.3					
Outlays	1108.079	0	0	0					
J. Corrective & Adaptive Maintenance									
Budgetary Resources	2945.112	750	650	656					
Outlays	2945.112	0	0	0					
TOTAL									
Budgetary Resources	18492.756	2680.751	3550	2508.9					
Outlays	18492.756	0	0	0					
Government FTE Costs									
Budgetary	850.795	500.183	185.343	142.601					

	PY - 1 and Earlier	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 and Beyond	Total
Resources									
Planning									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0					
Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0					
Maintenance									
Budgetary Resources	850.795	500.183	185.343	142.601					

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.

Full Time Equivalents BY08

Use the following table to provide the number of Government Full Time Equivalents (FTE) represented by the Government FTE Costs in the Summary of Spending Table. Numbers should be entered in decimal format for each of the categories listed.

FTE Table

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

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

Funding Questions BY08

Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?	No
How many and in what year?	
If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.	
Provide the Percent Budget Formulation (BF) for the budget year	0
Provide the Percent Budget Execution (BE) for the budget year	0

Funding Sources BY08

Funding Sources

* Costs in thousands

FS Name: MAX Code	Row Type	PY - 6 2000	PY - 5 2001	PY - 4 2002	PY - 3 2003	PY - 2 2004	PY - 1 2005	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 2012	BY + 5 2013	BY + 6 2014	BY + 7 2015	BY + 8 2016	Total

FS Name: MAX Code	Row Type	PY - 6 2000	PY - 5 2001	PY - 4 2002	PY - 3 2003	PY - 2 2004	PY - 1 2005	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 2012	BY + 5 2013	BY + 6 2014	BY + 7 2015	BY + 8 2016	Total
Working Capital Fund: 025-35-4586-0 On Ex.53: **Yes**	DME	0	0	3072	3942.704	5716.806	1708.055	1430.751	2250	1950									
	SS	0	0	1053.742	1076.531	1091.896	831.022	1750	1647	1366									
	Total	0	0	4125.742	5019.235	6808.702	2539.077	3180.751	3897	3316									
Total Yearly Budgets	DME	0	0	3072	3942.704	5716.806	1708.055	1430.751	2250	1950									
	SS	0	0	1053.742	1076.531	1091.896	831.022	1750	1647	1366									
	Total	0	0	4125.742	5019.235	6808.702	2539.077	3180.751	3897	3316									

I.C: ACQUISITION/CONTRACT STRATEGY BY08

Contract/Task Order Table BY08

Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

Contract/Task Orders Table

Row Number	Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order	Has the contract been awarded?	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order	Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	Is it performance based?	Competitively awarded?	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	Is EVM in the contract?	Does the contract include the required security and privacy clauses?	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?
1	I-OPC-22727	FFP T&M	Yes	5/10/2005	5/10/2005	12/31/2006	8700000.00	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Wissman, Bob	202-708-1772 / Bob_Wissman@ HUD.gov	Level 1	

Contract/Task Order Questions BY08

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

Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?	Yes
Explain why (508 Compliance)?	PASS IT Project Managers and GTMs are responsible for signing box 15 on the 720 to ensure 508 compliance, we work closely with the Government Technical Representative (GTR) during the procurement process. We are responsible for drafting specifications and minimum requirements. We make the Electronic and Information Technology (EIT) determination and we are entirely responsible for conducting and documenting market research. Justification for Section 508 exceptions is also

	required.
Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?	Yes
What is the date of your acquisition plan?	4/30/2004
If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?	
If "no," briefly explain why:	

I.D: PERFORMANCE INFORMATION BY08

Performance Goals & Measures BY08

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

Performance Goals and Measures

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2002	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	HUD developed this metric in 8/02; therefore no goals were established for FY 02.	No prior baseline existed because this metric was developed in 8/02.	No Planned Performance Metric Recorded for this year. The metric was established in 08/02	No Performance Metric Results Recorded for this year. The metric was established in 08/02
2002	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	HUD developed this metric in 8/02; therefore no goals were established for FY 02.	No prior baseline existed because this metric was developed in 8/02.	No Planned Performance Metric Recorded for this year.	No Actual Performance Metric Results Recorded for this year
2002	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management	HUD developed this metric in 8/02;	No prior baseline existed because this metric was developed in 8/02.	No Planned Performance Metric recorded for	No Actual Performance Metric Results recorded for

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
	and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	therefore no goals were established for FY 02.		this year.	this year.
2002	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	HUD developed this metric in 8/02; therefore no goals were established for FY 02.	No prior baseline existed because this metric was developed in 8/02.	No Planned Performance Metric recorded for this year.	No Actual Performance Metric Results recorded for this year.
2003	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	Improve the average physical conditions score for Public Housing properties.	75.54 is the average physical inspection score (Public Housing)	Improve the average physical inspection score for Public Housing properties by one percent (1%)	As of July 30, 2003 the average physical condition score for Public Housing Properties increased by 7%, thus exceeding the planned performance metric.
2003	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and	Limit the increase of the average cost per physical	$610.00 is the average cost per physical inspection (Public Housing)	Limit the increase of the Average cost per physical	As of July 30, 2003 the average cost per physical inspection for

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
	Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	inspection to no more than 3%.		inspection (Public Housing)to 3%	Public Housing Properties actually decreased by 16.9%, thus exceeding the planned performance metric.
2003	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	Improve the average physical conditions score for Multifamily Housing properties.	81.02 average physical inspection score (Multifamily Housing)	Improve the average physical inspection score for Multifamily Housing properties by one percent (1%)	As of July 30, 2003 the average physical inspection score for Public Housing properties decreased by 1.2%, thus not meeting the Planned Performance Metric.
2003	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	Limit the increase of the average cost per physical inspections for Multifamily Housing Properties. .	$610.00 is the average cost per physical inspection (Multifamily Housing)	Limit the increase of the average cost per physical inspection to no more than 3%.	As of July 30, 2003 the average cost per physical inspection for Multifamily Housing properties actually decreased by 16.9%, thus exceeding the planned performance metric.
2004	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1	81.85	75.54 average physical inspection score (Public Housing)	Improve the average physical inspection score for Public	72.85

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
	Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service			Housing properties by one percent (1%)	
2004	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	Limit the increase of the average cost per physical inspections for Public Housing Properties.	$610.00 average cost per physical inspection (Public Housing)	Limit the increase of the average cost per physical inspection to no more than 3%.	As of 9/30/04 the average cost per physical inspection for MFH decreased by 18.6%, thus exceeding the planned performance metric.
2004	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	81.02	81.02 average physical inspection score (Multifamily Housing)	Improve the average physical inspection score for Multifamily Housing properties by one percent (1%)	79.40
2004	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's	Limit the increase of the average cost per physical inspections for	$610.00 averagecost per physicalinspection(MultifamilyHousing)	Limit the increase of the average cost per physical inspection to no more than	As of 9/30/04 the average cost per physical inspection for MFH decreased by 18.6%, thus

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
	management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	Multifamily Housing Properties.		3%.	exceeding the planned performance metric.
2005	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	Improve the average physical conditions score for Public Housing properties.	75.54 average physical inspection score (Public Housing)	Improve the average physical inspection score for Public Housing properties by one percent (1%)	As of December 2005 the average physical inspection score for Public Housing properties is 75.5
2005	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	Limit the increase of the average cost per physical inspections for Public Housing Properties.	$610.00 average cost per physical inspection (Public Housing)	Limit the increase of the average cost per physical inspection to no more than 3%.	Average cost per physical inspection for Public Housing Properties has decreased by 10% due to the implemetation of RAP.
2005	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management	Improve the average physical conditions score for Multifamily Housing properties.	81.02 average physical inspection score (Multifamily Housing)	Improve the average physical inspection score for Multifamily Housing properties by	As of December 2005 the average physical inspection score for Multifamily

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
	and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service			one percent (1%)	Housing properties is 79.9
2005	6: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability6.1 Improve HUD's management and internal controls, including FHA's financial management, and resolve audit issues.6.2 Improve accountability, service delivery and customer service	Limit the increase of the average cost per physical inspections for Multifamily Housing Properties.	$610.00 averagecost per physicalinspection(MultifamilyHousing)	Limit the increase of the average cost per physical inspection to no more than 3%.	Average cost per physical inspection for Multifamily Housing Properties has decreased by 10% due to the implemetation of RAP.

FEA Performance Reference Model (PRM) BY08

FEA PRM

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2006	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	The long-term goal is to drive the Inspection price down approx. 10 â€"15%.	Average cost of physical inspection for 2005 - $610	Reduce the average cost per physical inspection by 3%.	Average cost of physical inspection for 2006 - $385
2006	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Monitoring	Percent of system code using object-oriented language	40% of system code in JAVA	100% of system code using object-oriented lanaguage	Convert all of system code to JAVA by Fall of 2008
2006	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics,	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Monitoring	Provide a Physical Assessment score	75.54 the average physical inspection	Improve the average physical inspection	85.3 the average physical inspection

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
	Management and Accountability				on100% of all required Public Housing Properties	score for Public Housing	score for Public Housing properties by one percent (1%)	score for Public Housing as of 12/31/2006
2006	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Reduce the average time per physical inspections for Public Housing Properties.	10 Min. average time per physical inspection (Public Housing)	Reduce the average time per physical inspection by 3%.	No results are expected due to implementation begining the second quarter of 08.
2006	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Physical Assessments scores represent entire property within 95% accurate.	The UPCS inspection software (DCD 2.3) provides a repeatable physical score within 95% accuracy.	The new UPCS software (RAPID 1.0) will identify repeated deficiencies and maintain generating a physical score within 95% accuracy.	No results are expected due to implementation begining the second quarter of 08.
2007	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	The long-term goal is to drive the Inspection price down approx. 10 â€"15%.	Average cost of physical inspection for 2005 - $610	Reduce the average cost per physical inspection by 3%.	Results will be reported December 2007
2007	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Monitoring	Percent of system code using object-oriented language	40% of system code in JAVA	100% of system code using object-oriented lanaguage	Convert all of system code to JAVA by Fall of 2008
2007	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Monitoring	Provide a Physical Assessment score on100% of all required Public Housing Properties	85.3 the average physical inspection score for Public Housing	Improve the average physical inspection score for Public Housing properties by one percent (1%)	Results will be reported December 2007
2007	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Reduce the average time per physical inspections for Public Housing Properties.	10 Min. average time per physical inspection (Public Housing)	Reduce the average time per physical inspection by 3%.	No results are expected due to implementation begining the second quarter of 08.
2007	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Physical Assessments scores	The UPCS inspection software	The new UPCS software	No results are expected due to

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
	Ethics, Management and Accountability				represent entire property within 95% accurate.	(DCD 2.3) provides a repeatable physical score within 95% accuracy.	(RAPID 1.0) will identify repeated deficiencies and maintain generating a physical score within 95% accuracy.	implementation begining the second quarter of 08.
2008	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Monitoring	Provide a Physical Assessment score on100% of all required Public Housing Properties	85.3 the average physical inspection score for Public Housing	Improve the average physical inspection score for Public Housing properties by one percent (1%)	Results will be reported December 2008
2008	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Monitoring	Percent of system code using object-oriented language	40% of system code in JAVA	100% of system code using object-oriented lanaguage	Convert all of system code to JAVA by Fall of 2008
2008	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Costs	Reduce the average cost per physical inspections for Public Housing Properties.	$610.00 average cost per physical inspection (Public Housing)	Reduce the average cost per physical inspection by 3%.	
2008	Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Physical Assessments scores represent entire property within 95% accurate.	The UPCS inspection software (DCD 2.3) provides a repeatable physical score within 95% accuracy.	The new UPCS software (RAPID 1.0) will identify repeated deficiencies and maintain generating a physical score within 95% accuracy.	

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

I.E: SECURITY AND PRIVACY BY08

Costs & Risks BY08
In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning

and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

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

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

Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment?	Yes
Provide the Percentage IT Security for the budget year	10.000000
Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.	Yes

Security: Planning Systems BY08

Systems in Planning - Security

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Planned or Actual C&A Completion Date
Physical Assessment Sub-system	Contractor and Government	3/4/2005	5/27/2005
Physical Assessment Sub-system	Contractor and Government	2/7/2008	5/25/2008

Security: Operational Systems BY08

Operational Systems - Security

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Physical Assessment Sub-system	Contractor and Government	High	Yes	5/27/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/8/2005	12/9/2005

Security: Weaknesses & Contractor Procedures BY08

Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?	Yes
If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process?	Yes
Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?	No

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

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

The annual security awareness training for PASS consists of an Intranet-based course designed to cover security domains that are needed for end users (both employees and contractors). The domains covered are security of email, Internet, identity theft, privacy protection, rules of behavior, mobile devices, access control, cyber crime, threats, vulnerabilities, personally identifiable information, and ethics. Specialized security training is offered to employees and contractors whose position require additional security training and includes patch management, management participation, physical security, least privilege principle, incident response, CIA, and risk management. In support of security awareness training goals,

HUD deployed security awareness posters, provided security awareness messages on employee pay vouchers, posted awareness information on the HUD Intranet, and regularly disseminated awareness broadcast messages via electronic mail.

HUD Handbook 2400.25: Computer Security Policy Handbook, ADP Security Program, outlines the department's Data Processing Security Program. The policies outlined in the Handbook support the ADP security requirements found in the Model Framework for Management Control Over Automated Information Systems and the ADP Security Guidance from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) within circulars A-123, A-127 and A-130. The policies contained in this notebook apply to all ADP systems operated by, or on behalf of, HUD and include mainframes, minicomputers, microcomputers and network systems. PASS Contractors are required to comply with HUD's ADP Security Program regulations.

At no time do the Avineon contractor staff have any access to any operational databases or operational software code, so there is little or no chance for them to enter any malicious code or errors. The contracts provide for non-disclosure clauses in those instances where required, and regular reports are made to the Project Manager and the Government Technical Representative on roll on/off of consultant staff and weekly/monthly activities and progress. Security procedures are provided for contract staff in the same manner as all other staff or external users. Each contract employee that has access to any level of system is provided for a unique -C- ID, consisting of a C and 6 digits. Their access of systems is tracked by audit logs the same as any other users.

Privacy: Planning & Operational Systems BY08

Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy

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

I.F: ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE (EA) BY08

General EA Questions BY08

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

Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?	Yes
If "no," please explain why this investment is not included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?	
Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?	Yes
If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.	Transition Plan provides a detailed description of activities associated with developing and implementing the Rental Housing Assistance business function, and PASS, and turns them into a logical sequence of steps focused on identifying, prioritizing, and sequencing the transition activities that will be necessary to achieve HUD's Target EA.
If "no," please explain why this investment is not included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?	

FEA SRM BY08

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

Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused Name	FEA Service Component Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
Performance Management	Performance Management refers to a range of measures designed to assure that Federal resources are used efficiently and effectively.	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Performance Management			No Reuse	20
Portfolio Management	Support the administration of a group of investments held by an organization.	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Portfolio Management			No Reuse	20
Risk Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support the identification and probabilities or chances of hazards as they relate to a task, decision or long-term goal.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Risk Management			No Reuse	20
Information Retrieval	Defines the set of capabilities that allow access to data and information for use by an organization and its stakeholders.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	20
Process Tracking	Defines the set of capabilities to allow the monitoring of activities within the business.	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	20

Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.
A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than

answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

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

Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

FEA TRM BY08

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

Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 1.2, PERL
Performance Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 1.2, PERL
Portfolio Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 1.2, PERL
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 1.2, PERL
Risk Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 1.2, PERL
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Web SQL 1.2 / Unspecified, Nomad 6.50a
Performance Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Web SQL 1.2 / Unspecified, Nomad 6.50a
Portfolio Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Web SQL 1.2 / Unspecified, Nomad 6.50a
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Web SQL 1.2 / Unspecified, Nomad 6.50a
Risk Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Web SQL 1.2 / Unspecified, Nomad 6.50a
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	DEPCON Central v5r2, Crystal Reports version unspecified / 5.0 / 6.0
Performance Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	DEPCON Central v5r2, Crystal Reports version unspecified / 5.0 / 6.0
Portfolio Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	DEPCON Central v5r2, Crystal Reports version unspecified / 5.0 / 6.0
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	DEPCON Central v5r2, Crystal Reports version unspecified / 5.0 / 6.0
Risk Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	DEPCON Central v5r2, Crystal Reports version unspecified / 5.0 / 6.0
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Microsoft Office 95 / 97, Microsoft Excel 97
Performance Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Microsoft Office 95 / 97, Microsoft Excel 97
Portfolio Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Microsoft Office 95 / 97, Microsoft Excel 97
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Microsoft Office 95 / 97, Microsoft Excel 97
Risk Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Microsoft Office 95 / 97, Microsoft Excel 97
Information	Component	Presentation /	Static Display	Adobe Acrobat Reader 3.0 / 5.0

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
Retrieval	Framework	Interface		
Performance Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	Adobe Acrobat Reader 3.0 / 5.0
Portfolio Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	Adobe Acrobat Reader 3.0 / 5.0
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	Adobe Acrobat Reader 3.0 / 5.0
Risk Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	Adobe Acrobat Reader 3.0 / 5.0
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	CA Top Secret
Performance Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	CA Top Secret
Portfolio Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	CA Top Secret
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	CA Top Secret
Risk Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	CA Top Secret
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Lotus Notes 5.0
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Lotus Notes 5.0
Portfolio Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Lotus Notes 5.0
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Lotus Notes 5.0
Risk Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Lotus Notes 5.0
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase version unspecified / 11.0 / 11.1.1 / 11.5.1 / 11.5.1.1 / 11.5.2 / 11.9 / 12, Microsoft Access 95/97, SQL, Sybase SQL Central
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase version unspecified / 11.0 / 11.1.1 / 11.5.1 / 11.5.1.1 / 11.5.2 / 11.9 / 12, Microsoft Access 95/97, SQL, Sybase SQL Central
Portfolio Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase version unspecified / 11.0 / 11.1.1 / 11.5.1 / 11.5.1.1 / 11.5.2 / 11.9 / 12, Microsoft Access 95/97, SQL, Sybase SQL Central
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase version unspecified / 11.0 / 11.1.1 / 11.5.1 / 11.5.1.1 / 11.5.2 / 11.9 / 12, Microsoft Access 95/97, SQL, Sybase SQL Central
Risk Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase version unspecified / 11.0 / 11.1.1 / 11.5.1 / 11.5.1.1 / 11.5.2 / 11.9 / 12, Microsoft Access 95/97, SQL, Sybase SQL Central
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	ColdFusion 3.0 / 3.1 / 4.0.1/ 4.5.1 / ColdFusion Enterprise
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	ColdFusion 3.0 / 3.1 / 4.0.1/ 4.5.1 / ColdFusion Enterprise
Portfolio	Service Platform	Delivery	Application Servers	ColdFusion 3.0 / 3.1 / 4.0.1/ 4.5.1 /

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
Management	and Infrastructure	Servers		ColdFusion Enterprise
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	ColdFusion 3.0 / 3.1 / 4.0.1/ 4.5.1 / ColdFusion Enterprise
Risk Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	ColdFusion 3.0 / 3.1 / 4.0.1/ 4.5.1 / ColdFusion Enterprise
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	ERWin 3.5 / Unspecified, Oracle Designer 2000, TOAD 7.2
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	ERWin 3.5 / Unspecified, Oracle Designer 2000, TOAD 7.2
Portfolio Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	ERWin 3.5 / Unspecified, Oracle Designer 2000, TOAD 7.2
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	ERWin 3.5 / Unspecified, Oracle Designer 2000, TOAD 7.2
Risk Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	ERWin 3.5 / Unspecified, Oracle Designer 2000, TOAD 7.2
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	PVCS
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	PVCS
Portfolio Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	PVCS
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	PVCS
Risk Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	PVCS
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	UNIX, MS-DOS, Microsoft Windows NT 3.51 / 4.0 SP5 / 4.0 SP6 and SP6a / version unspecified, SAS IML - Interactive Matrix Language 6.09, Microsoft Visual Basic (version unspecified) / 5.x / 6.0
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	UNIX, MS-DOS, Microsoft Windows NT 3.51 / 4.0 SP5 / 4.0 SP6 and SP6a / version unspecified, SAS IML - Interactive Matrix Language 6.09, Microsoft Visual Basic (version unspecified) / 5.x / 6.0
Portfolio Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	UNIX, MS-DOS, Microsoft Windows NT 3.51 / 4.0 SP5 / 4.0 SP6 and SP6a / version unspecified, SAS IML - Interactive Matrix Language 6.09, Microsoft Visual Basic (version unspecified) / 5.x / 6.0
Process Tracking	Service Platform and	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	UNIX, MS-DOS, Microsoft Windows NT 3.51 / 4.0 SP5 / 4.0 SP6 and SP6a /

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
	Infrastructure			version unspecified, SAS IML - Interactive Matrix Language 6.09, Microsoft Visual Basic (version unspecified) / 5.x / 6.0
Risk Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	UNIX, MS-DOS, Microsoft Windows NT 3.51 / 4.0 SP5 / 4.0 SP6 and SP6a / version unspecified, SAS IML - Interactive Matrix Language 6.09, Microsoft Visual Basic (version unspecified) / 5.x / 6.0

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

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

Reuse & Information Sharing BY08

Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?	No
If "yes," please describe how the application will leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government.	

Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?	Yes
If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?	No
If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).	

FEA Primary Mapping BY08

FEA Primary Mapping

Reference Model:	BRM
Business Area:	Support Delivery of Services
Line of Business:	Controls and Oversight
Sub Function:	Program Monitoring
Mapping Code:	301093

II.A: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS BY08

Analysis Background BY08

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

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

Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?	Yes
If "yes," what is the date of the analysis?	8/1/2006
If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?	
If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:	

Alternatives Table BY08

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

Alternatives Analysis Results

Send to OMB	Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
True	Alternative I Status Quo Option: maintenance but no further development.	This is a no cost option. It achieves no net present value or ROI. Maintain the status quo environment. Under this alternative the PASS system would enter into a steady state maintenance environment. Only emergency changes would be made to the system. The following are the types of emergency changes that can occur: Corrective Maintenance and Adaptive Maintenance.	13243	0
True	Alternative II â€" Full Development with no modernization	Modify the existing system using its current architecture to better support the business community. Modifications will be made to current modules using ColdFusion without making any changes to structure or workflow. This alternative will alleviate some of the emergency change requests produced under Alt 1. The business community would have better capabilities to manage the program. Modifications to the current system will be done as needed, concentrating on corrective and adaptive maintenance.	34594	39219
True	Alternative III â€" Full Development with modernization	Option 3 represents the conservative approach for a resource-constrained environment. It does not represent the best ROI (still a very healthy 627% versus 510% for option 4 and 233% for option 2) and has the highet incremental benefit value ($115.9 Million versus $115.8 million for option 4 and and $39 million for option 2).	33176	115904
True	Alternative IV â€" Full development with Redesign and rewrite The PASS system.	Redesign and rewrite the PASS system using Oracle Systems front end and back end. The new system will be redesigned and developed using an enterprise Java platform that can support large-scale application systems aligned with a single vendor. The new system will leverage Java technology based on a multi-tier architecture, which supports reusable components and where most of the application's logic is moved from the client to the server into one or more business objects.	38492	115882

Selected Alternative BY08

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

Alternative 3 (ROI 627%) was selected because it provides a solution that meets the goals of the physical inspection initiative and is closely aligned with the direction of HUD's enterprise architecture (EA). In addition, this solution provides HUD with the path to meet all mandatory policy, rules, and regulations regarding security profile, privacy protection and federal reporting standards. This alternative provides a technical solution with the most cost effective measure, incremental benefits, and the total Return On Investment; ultimately this alternative provides the best value for HUD. Employing a multi-tiered architecture and using a component-based development approach, supports reuse during development and eases complexity during maintenance. This alternative also provides the program staff with access to data in a near real-time environment. This allows for a more complete and timely access to information for streamlining the decision making and processing of inspection data results. Alternative 3 increases the processing throughput of the inspection program -- from scheduling, field inspection, review, and payment. The following alternatives analysis provides the justification for the new development efforts that are planned for FY 07 and FY 08. A 10-year cost estimate has been developed to illustrate the on-going operations and maintenance costs that will be required to support this development once the enhancements become operational. The information presented in the Summary of Spending table includes the cost estimates for the proposed new development work scheduled for FY 07 and beyond. Alternative 3 (Redesigning the system using up-to-date technology) was selected based on the costs and benefits associated with each of the three other alternatives. The project team has identified the project resources -data/info with a medium or hign probability of occurance that might dealy the implementation. If this risk dealy the project, the operational and maitenance cost will increase and benefit will reduce in same

period of time. As a result ROI will be also reduce.

What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?
The qualitative benefits will be that as we proceed, PASS will be enhanced to to the extent possible to provide its clients with additional analyses and refinements of existing analyses that can be formulated with current technology.

Employing a multi-tiered architecture and using a component-based development approach, supports reuse during development and eases complexity during maintenance. This alternative also provides the program staff with access to data in a near real-time environment. This allows for a more complete and timely access to information for streamlining the decision making and processing of inspection data results.

Increases the processing throughput of the inspection program -- from scheduling, field inspection, review, and payment. This will drive the Inspection price down approx. 10 to 15%.

II.B: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08

Risk Management Plan BY08

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

Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes
What is the date of the risk management plan?	7/5/2005
Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?	No
If "yes," describe any significant changes to the Risk Management Plan:	
If there currently is no risk plan, will a plan be developed?	
If "yes," what is the planned completion date of the risk plan?	
If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?	

Investment Risks BY08

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

The most common natural threat is weather related event, such as a snowstorm, that forces a closing of the Government, but other events, such as thunderstorms, can affect the delivery of power to Government offices and cause temporary brownouts/blackouts, which can in turn lead to a loss of data. To safeguard against data loss due to power outages, and so forth it is desirable that an uninterruptible power supply or backup generator be provided so that power will be adequate for orderly shutdown (FISCAM SC-2.2). Further, frequent and regular backups of data from workstations to streaming tape or CD-ROM should be performed), and the media should be stored in an off-site facility (FISCAM SC-2.1). Intentional threats to the system are always possible. Disgruntled or distressed employees could damage hardware and manipulate data. Users could also inadvertently shutdown the systems. Threats against government operations ranged from domestic bombings, as in Oklahoma City in 1995, to lawful and peaceful protests, which have blocked streets and caused inconvenience for workers. The more probable and more pertinent threat, however, is the release and transmission of computer viruses, worms, and Trojan horses. For example, the release of the I LOVEYOU virus on May 4-5, 2002 cost close to $10 billion in lost productivity, and exposed many people to loss of data. The PASS system has been developed with all risks to data and users in mind. Unintentional human threats range from the loss of productivity due to illness, including long term, debilitating illnesses, to accident, negligence, or other causes. Some may also be the result of failure to correct reported problems, which can affect the ability to deliver scheduled products including documentation and reports.

II.C: COST AND SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE BY08

Earned Value BY08

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

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

What is the Planned Value (PV)?	13.793000
What is the Earned Value (EV)?	13.726000
What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?	13.516000
What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)?	Contractor and Government
EVMS "As of" date:	6/30/2006
What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI = EV/PV)?	0.995000
What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)?	-0.067000

What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)?	1.016000	
What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)?	0.210000	

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

Cost/Schedule Variance BY08

Is the CV% or SV% greater than 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)	No
If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?	
If "yes," explain the variance:	
If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?	
What is the most current "Estimate at Completion"?	23.566000

Performance Baseline BY08

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

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

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

Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (Estimated)	Completion Date		Total Cost		Schedule (# days)	Cost	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
1	PASS Delevopment & Maintenance Plan '03, '04, '05, '06, '07	09/30/2012	$57.425	09/30/2010	04/18/2006	$52.125	$13.607	1626	$38.518	0.32%
1.1	A. Project Initiation/Planning	09/30/2010	$1.924	09/30/2010		$1.924				0%
1.2	B. Requirements Definition	03/12/2006	$2.006	03/12/2006	03/14/2006	$2.006	$2.021	-2	($0.015)	1.00%
1.3	C. System Design	04/18/2006	$2.650	04/18/2006	04/18/2006	$2.650	$1.420	0	$1.230	1.00%
1.4	D. Software Acquisition	01/20/2003	$0.038	01/20/2003	01/20/2003	$0.038	$0.038	0	$0.000	1.00%
1.5	E. Hardware/Infrastructure Acquisition	11/18/2003	$0.041	11/18/2003	11/18/2003	$0.041	$0.041	0	$0.000	1.00%
1.6	F. New Development/Perfective Maintenance	06/22/2006	$5.160	06/22/2006		$5.160	$2.716		$2.444	0.70%
1.7	G. Systems Integration & Testing	08/16/2006	$4.058	08/16/2006		$4.058	$1.756		$2.302	0.63%
1.8	H. Installation & Deployment	08/21/2008	$0.737	08/21/2008	02/01/2006	$0.737	$0.366	932	$0.371	1.00%
1.9	I. Sytems Operations	08/29/2008	$4.029	08/29/2008		$4.029	$2.599		$1.430	0.63%
1.10	J. Corrective & Adaptive Maintenance	08/29/2008	$4.099	08/29/2008		$4.099	$2.650		$1.449	0.63%
1.11	FY09 Devepoment, Maintenancen and Enhancements	08/31/2009	$4.000							%
1.11.1	A. Project Initiation/Planning	11/01/2008	$0.200							0%
1.11.2	B. Requirements Definition	12/31/2008	$0.800							0%
1.11.3	C. System Design	02/25/2009	$0.800							0%
1.11.4	D. Software Acquisition	03/31/2009	$0.100							0%
1.11.5	E.	03/31/2009	$0.100							0%

ID	Description	Date	Cost							%
	Hardware/Infrastructure Acquisition									
1.11.6	F. New Developement/Perfective Maintenance	07/31/2009	$1.200							0%
1.11.7	G. Systems Integration & Testing	08/15/2009	$0.600							0%
1.11.8	H. Installation & Deployment	08/31/2009	$0.200							0%
1.12	FY09 O&M	08/31/2009	$1.300							%
1.12.1	I. Sytems Operations	08/31/2009	$0.520							0%
1.12.2	J. Corrective & Adaptive Maintenance	08/31/2009	$0.780							0%
1.13	FY10 Devepoment, Maintenancen and Enhancements	09/30/2010	$2.970			$2.970				0%
1.14	FY10 O&M	09/30/2010	$2.089			$2.089				0%
1.15	FY11 Devepoment, Maintenancen and Enhancements	09/30/2011	$2.970			$2.970				0%
1.16	FY11 O&M	09/30/2011	$2.095			$2.095				0%
1.17	FY12 and beyond Devepoment, Maintenancen and Enhancements	09/30/2012	$9.190			$9.190				0%
1.18	FY12 and beyond O&M	09/30/2012	$8.069			$8.069				0%
Project Totals		09/30/2012	$57.425	09/30/2010	04/18/2006	$52.125	$13.607	1626	$38.518	0.32

III.A: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08

Risk Management Plan BY08

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

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

Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes
What is the date of the risk management plan?	7/5/2005
Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?	No
If "yes," describe any significant changes to the Risk Management Plan:	
If there currently is no risk plan, will a plan be developed?	
If "yes," what is the planned completion date of the risk plan?	
If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?	

III.B: COST AND SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE BY08

Operational Analysis BY08

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

Performance Baseline BY08

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

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

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

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

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

Partners BY08

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

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

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

Stakeholder Table

Partner Agency Name	Partner Agency	Joint Exhibit Approval Date

Partnering Strategies BY08

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

Partner Capital Assets within this Investment

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

Partner Funding BY08

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

Partner Funding Strategies

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

Analysis Background BY08

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

Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?	Yes
If "yes," what is the date of the analysis?	8/1/2006
If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?	
If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:	

Alternatives Table BY08

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

Alternatives Analysis Results

Send to OMB	Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
True	Alternative I Status Quo Option: maintenance but no further development.	This is a no cost option. It achieves no net present value or ROI. Maintain the status quo environment. Under this alternative the PASS system would enter into a steady state maintenance environment. Only emergency changes would be made to the system. The following are the types of emergency changes that can occur: Corrective Maintenance and Adaptive Maintenance.	13243	0
True	Alternative II â€" Full Development with no modernization	Modify the existing system using its current architecture to better support the business community. Modifications will be made to current modules using ColdFusion without making any changes to structure or workflow. This alternative will alleviate some of the emergency change requests produced under Alt 1. The business community would have better capabilities to manage the program. Modifications to the current system will be done as needed, concentrating on corrective and adaptive maintenance.	34594	39219
True	Alternative III â€" Full Development with modernization	Option 3 represents the conservative approach for a resource-constrained environment. It does not represent the best ROI (still a very healthy 627% versus 510% for option 4 and 233% for option 2) and has the highet incremental benefit value ($115.9 Million versus $115.8 million for option 4 and and $39 million for option 2).	33176	115904
True	Alternative IV â€" Full development with Redesign and rewrite The PASS system.	Redesign and rewrite the PASS system using Oracle Systems front end and back end. The new system will be redesigned and developed using an enterprise Java platform that can support large-scale application systems aligned with a single vendor. The new system will leverage Java technology based on a multi-tier architecture, which supports reusable components and where most of the application's logic is moved from the client to the server into one or more business objects.	38492	115882

Selected Alternative BY08

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

Alternative 3 (ROI 627%) was selected because it provides a solution that meets the goals of the physical inspection initiative and is closely aligned with the direction of HUD's enterprise architecture (EA). In addition, this solution provides HUD with the path to meet all mandatory policy, rules, and regulations regarding security profile, privacy protection and federal reporting standards. This alternative provides a technical solution with the most cost effective measure, incremental benefits, and the total Return On Investment; ultimately this alternative provides the best value for HUD. Employing a multi-tiered architecture and using a component-based development approach, supports reuse during development and eases complexity during maintenance. This alternative also provides the program staff with access to data in a near real-time environment. This allows for a more complete and timely access to information for streamlining the decision making and processing of inspection data results. Alternative 3 increases the processing throughput of the inspection program -- from scheduling, field inspection, review, and payment. The following alternatives analysis provides the justification for the new development efforts that are planned for FY 07 and FY 08. A 10-year cost estimate has been developed to illustrate the on-going operations and maintenance costs that will be required to support this development once the

enhancements become operational. The information presented in the Summary of Spending table includes the cost estimates for the proposed new development work scheduled for FY 07 and beyond. Alternative 3 (Redesigning the system using up-to-date technology) was selected based on the costs and benefits associated with each of the three other alternatives. The project team has identified the project resources -data/info with a medium or hign probability of occurance that might dealy the implementation. If this risk dealy the project, the operational and maitenance cost will increase and benefit will reduce in same period of time. As a result ROI will be also reduce.

What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?
The qualitative benefits will be that as we proceed, PASS will be enhanced to to the extent possible to provide its clients with additional analyses and refinements of existing analyses that can be formulated with current technology.

Employing a multi-tiered architecture and using a component-based development approach, supports reuse during development and eases complexity during maintenance. This alternative also provides the program staff with access to data in a near real-time environment. This allows for a more complete and timely access to information for streamlining the decision making and processing of inspection data results.

Increases the processing throughput of the inspection program -- from scheduling, field inspection, review, and payment. This will drive the Inspection price down approx. 10 to 15%.

Quantitative Benefits BY08
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Federal Quantitative Benefits

	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Cost Avoidance
PY - 6 2000	0	0		
PY - 5 2001	0	0		
PY - 4 2002	0	0		
PY - 3 2003	0	0		
PY - 2 2004	0	0		
PY - 1 2005	0	0		
PY 2006	0	0		
CY 2007	0	0		
BY 2008	0	0		
BY + 1 2009	0	0		
BY + 2 2010	0	0		
BY + 3 2011	0	0		
BY + 4 2012	0	0		
BY + 5 2013	0	0		
BY + 6 2014	0	0		
BY + 7 2015	0	0		

	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Cost Avoidance
BY + 8 2016	0	0		
Total LLC Benefit	0	0		

IV.B: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08

Risk Management Plan BY08

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

Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes
What is the date of the risk management plan?	7/5/2005
Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?	No
If "yes," describe any significant changes to the Risk Management Plan:	
If there currently is no risk plan, will a plan be developed?	
If "yes," what is the planned completion date of the risk plan?	
If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?	

Investment Risks BY08

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

The most common natural threat is weather related event, such as a snowstorm, that forces a closing of the Government, but other events, such as thunderstorms, can affect the delivery of power to Government offices and cause temporary brownouts/blackouts, which can in turn lead to a loss of data. To safeguard against data loss due to power outages, and so forth it is desirable that an uninterruptible power supply or backup generator be provided so that power will be adequate for orderly shutdown (FISCAM SC-2.2). Further, frequent and regular backups of data from workstations to streaming tape or CD-ROM should be performed), and the media should be stored in an off-site facility (FISCAM SC-2.1). Intentional threats to the system are always possible. Disgruntled or distressed employees could damage hardware and manipulate data. Users could also inadvertently shutdown the systems. Threats against government operations ranged from domestic bombings, as in Oklahoma City in 1995, to lawful and peaceful protests, which have blocked streets and caused inconvenience for workers. The more probable and more pertinent threat, however, is the release and transmission of computer viruses, worms, and Trojan horses. For example, the release of the I LOVEYOU virus on May 4-5, 2002 cost close to $10 billion in lost productivity, and exposed many people to loss of data. The PASS system has been developed with all risks to data and users in mind. Unintentional human threats range from the loss of productivity due to illness, including long term, debilitating illnesses, to accident, negligence, or other causes. Some may also be the result of failure to correct reported problems, which can affect the ability to deliver scheduled products including documentation and reports.

IV.C: COST AND SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE BY08

Earned Value BY08

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

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

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

Please provide a brief summary of the operational analysis results.

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

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

What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)?	Contractor and Government
EVMS "As of" date:	6/30/2006
What is the Planned Value (PV)?	13.793000
What is the Earned Value (EV)?	13.726000
What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?	13.516000
What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI = EV/PV)?	0.995000
What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)?	-0.067000
What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)?	1.016000
What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)?	0.210000

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

Cost/Schedule Variance BY08

Is the CV% or SV% greater than 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)	No
If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?	
If "yes," explain the variance:	
If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?	
What is the most current "Estimate at Completion"?	23.566000

Performance Baseline BY08

This sub-sections questions are applicable to ALL capital assets.	
Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year?	No
Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in $ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate 0 for any milestone no longer active.	
If "yes," when was it approved by OMB?	

Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline (EGov)

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete	Agency Responsible For Activity
		Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (Estimated)	Completion Date		Total Cost		Schedule (# days)	Cost		
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual				
Project Totals											