BY08 Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary
Exhibit 300

PART I: SUMMARY INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION

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

Section. A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

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

(1) Date of Submission:	09/11/2006
(2) Agency:	422
(3) Bureau:	00
(4) Name of this Capital Asset: (250 Character Max)	FastLane
(5) Unique ID (Unique Project Identifier):	422-00-04-00-01-0028-00
Format xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx (For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency **ID** system.)	
(6) What kind of investment will this be in FY2008?	Operations and Maintenance
(7) What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to **OMB?**	FY2001 or earlier

(8) Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes a gap in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap: (2500 Char Max) FastLane (www.fastlane.nsf.gov) is a web-based grants management system used by over 250,000 scientists, educators, technology experts and administrators, including the country's top researchers, to prepare and submit NSF proposals for funding, check on the status of their proposals, peer-review these proposals, prepare and submit revised budgets, prepare and submit post-award notifications, and report on the progress of their government-funded research. Organizations can also request funding increments and report on billions of dollars in expenditures through FastLane. In 2003, the National Science Foundation won the President's Quality Award for Management Excellence for recognition of exemplary performance and results in the area of 'Expanded Electronic Government' (www.opm.gov/pqa/).

(9) Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	08/30/2006

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

111 Contact Information of Project Manager?

Name:	Daniel Hofherr
Phone Number:	703-292-4241
E-Mail:	dhofherr@nsf.gov

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

(a) Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	yes
(b) Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	
[1] If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	
[2] If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	
[3] If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	

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

"yes," select all that apply:

President's Management Agenda (PMA) Initiatives

Expanded E-Government

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

FastLane fully supports the Expanded E-Government goal, and NSF remains an active Grants.gov Partner Agency. The extensive experience that NSF has with Electronic Grants is leveraged in the development and implementation of Grants.gov, as well as the Grants Management LOB. FastLane is fully integrated with Grants.gov Apply, and NSF will offer FastLane E-Authentication credentials for use by Grants.gov.

(14) Does this investment support a program assessed using OMB's no Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)?

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

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

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

(16) What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council PM Guidance)?	Level 1

(17) What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance):	(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
(18) Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's 'high risk" memo)?	no
(19) Is this a financial management system?	no
(a) If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	
[1] If "yes," which compliance area:	
[2] If "no," what does it address?	
(b) If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52:	

(20) What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware %:	**Software** %:	**Services** %:	**Other** %:	**Total** %
	10	90	0	100

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

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

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

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

Section B: Summary of Funding (All Capital Assets)

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

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT P^{H}ASES (DEPORTED IN MILLIONS)
All amounts represent Budget Authority (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget 'decisions)

	PY-1 & Spending Prior to 2006	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY. 2008	BY +1 2009	BY+2 2010	BY+3 2011	BY+4 2012 and beyond	Total
Planning	$0.000	$0.000	$0.000	$0.000					
Acquisition	$0.000	$0.000	$0.000	$0.000					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition	$0.000	$0.000	$0.000	$0.000					
Operations Maintenance	$22.000	$4.740	$7.000	$4.760					
TOTAL	$22.000	$4.740	$7.000	$4.760					
Government	FTE Costs should not included in he amounts provided above.								
Government FTE Costs	$3.700	$0.950	$0.980	$1.010					
Number of FTE represented by cost	30								

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

(2) Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? no

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

(3) If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.

Due to budget constraints, spending for FastLane O&M was less than approved. NSF mitigated the effects of this by addressing only the highest priority maintenance and regulatory requirements.

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

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

Contract or Task Order Number: CO-21/0537356 Type of Contract/TO Used: Cost Plus Fixed Fee
Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes
Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:
06/01/2005
Contract/TO Start Date:
06/01/2005

 Contract/TO End Date:
05/30/2007
Contract/TO Total Value ($M): $6.000 Inter Agency Acquisition: no
Performance Based Contract: no
Competitively Awarded Contract: yes
Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: no
Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: Patricia S. Williams
CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 703-292-8240 / pswillia@nsf.gov
CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): 3
If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to
support this acquisition? (Y/N)

Contract or Task Order Number: BZ-11/0533982 Type of Contract/TO Used: Cost Plus Fixed Fee
Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes
Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:
05/01/2005
Contract/TO Start Date:
05/01/2005
Contract/TO End Date:
04/30/2007
Contract/TO Total Value ($M): $32.200 Inter Agency Acquisition: no
Performance Based Contract: no
Competitively Awarded Contract: yes
Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes
Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: Patricia S. Williams
CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 703-292-8240 / pswillia@nsf.gov
CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): 3
If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to
support this acquisition? (Y/N)

(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:

For Contract CO-21/0537356, no DME work is expected, and the contract does not meet NSF's threshold for
EVMS. BZ-11/0533982 does implement EVMS in support of PRAMIS DME work.

(3) Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? yes
Section 508 Compliance Explanation:
The system was reviewed and modified, as needed, from 2001 through 2005 for Section 508 compliance. Each
maintenance change is reviewed for 508 compliance before being implemented. The FastLane team remains
vigilant about providing the most accessible system feasible for the hundreds of thousands of users in the
research community. Both FastLane task orders require, as a standard part of NSF's release process, that
each maintenance change be checked for 508 compliance before being implemented.

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

yes
   (a) If "yes", what is the date?
07/14/2004
   (b) If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?
       [1] If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

Agencies must use Table 1 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.

Table 1

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/ Baseline (from previous year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2004	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Proposal Submission	Maintain % of proposals submitted electronically	In 2003, Over 99.9% proposals submitted electronically	Over 99.925%	99.99% - As of July 31 , 2004, only 4 proposals out of over 40,000 proposals submitted to NSF have been submitted via paper.
2004	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Signature of Proposals	Improve % of proposals signed electronically	In 2003, Over 95% of proposals signed electronically	Over 97%	98.82% - Of the 40,700 proposals submitted between Oct 1 2003 thru June 30 2004, 40,219 have been electronically signed.

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/ Baseline (from previous year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2004	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Submission of Principal Investigator Transfers	Improve % Nearly all of PI transferred In electronically	2003 Over 80% of Pls transferred electronically	Over 95%	100% - Of the 408 PI Transfer Requests that were submitted between October 1, 2003 and July 31, 2004, all 408 PI Transfer Requests were submitted electronically.
2005	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Proposal Submission	Maintain % of proposals submitted electronically	In 2004, Over 99.99% proposals submitted electronically	Over 99.95%	99.99% - As of July 31, 2005, only 2 proposals out of over 38,890 proposals submitted to NSF have been submitted via paper.
2005	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Signature of Proposals	Improve % of proposals signed electronically	In 2004, 98.82% of proposals signed electronically	Over 98.5%	99.86% - Of the 38,893 proposals submitted between Oct 1 2004 thru July 31 2005, 38,837 have been electronically signed.)
2005	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Submission of Principal Investigator Transfers	Improve % Nearly all of PI transferred electronically	In 2004 100% of PIs transferred electronically	Over 97.5%	100% - Of the 306 PI Transfer Requests that were submitted between October 1, 2004 and July 31, 2005, 306 PI Transfer Requests were submitted electronically.
2005	Organizational Excellence: Panels using the FastLane Interactive Panel System	Improve %Over 90% of panels using electronic means.	In 2004 Over 75% of panels used electronic means	Over 90%	82.37% - As of July 31, 2005, only 289 panels out of over 1639 panels conducted by NSF have used paper.
2005	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Submission of Graduate Research Fellowship Applications	Improve %Over 90% of fellowship appli-cations submitted electronically	In 2004 85% of fellowship applications submitted electronically	Over 90%	100% - As of July 31, 2005, 0 proposals out of over 9150 Graduate Research Fellowship Applications submitted to NSF have been submitted via paper.
2006	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Signature of Proposals	Improve % of proposals signed electronically	In 2005, 98.86% of proposals signed electronically	Over 99%	99.99% - As of July 31, 2006, only 2 proposals out of 36,857 proposals submitted to NSF have been submitted via paper.
2006	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Submission of Principal Investigator Transfers	Improve % Nearly all of PI transferred electronically	In 2005 100% of Pls transferred electronically	Over 99%	97.16% - Of the 387 PI Transfer Requests that were submitted between October 1, 2005 and July 31, 2006, 376 PI Transfer Requests were submitted electronically.
2006	Organizational Excellence: Panels using the FastLane Interactive Panel System	Improve %Over 90% of panels using electronic means.	In 2005 82.37% of panels used electronic means.	Over 95%	96.45% - As of July 31, 2006, 1223 panels out of 1268 peer review panels starting between October 1, 2005 and July 31, 2006 have used the IPS
2006	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Submission of Graduate Research Fellowship Applications	Improve %Over 90% of fellowship appli-cations submitted electronically	In 2005 100% of fellowship applications submitted electronically	Over 92.5%	100% - As of July 31, 2006, 0 proposals out of 9130 Graduate Research Fellowship Applications submitted to NSF have been submitted via paper.
2007	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Signature of Proposals	Maintain % of proposals signed electronically	2006 Target of 99% of proposals signed electronically	Over 99%	
2007	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Submission of Principal Investigator Transfers	Maintain % Nearly all of PI transferred electronically	2006 Target of 100% of PIs transferred electronically	100%	

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/ Baseline (from previous year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2007	Organizational Excellence: Panels using the FastLane Interactive Panel System	Maintain % Over 90% of panels using electronic means.	2006 Target of over 95% of panels using electronic means.	Over 95%	
2007	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Submission of Graduate Research Fellowship Applications	Maintain % Over 90% of fellowship applications submitted electronically	2006 Target of over 92.5% of fellowship applications submitted electronically	Over 92.5%	
2008	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Signature of Proposals	Maintain % of proposals signed electronically	2007 Target of 99% of proposals signed electronically	Over 99%	
2008	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Submission of Principal Investigator Transfers	Maintain % Nearly all of PI transferred electronically	2007 Target of 100% of Pls transferred electronically	100%	
2008	Organizational Excellence: Panels using the FastLane Interactive Panel System	Maintain % Over 90% of panels using electronic means.	2007 Target of over 95% of panels using electronic means.	Over 95%	
2008	Organizational Excellence: Electronic Submission of Graduate Research Fellowship Applications	Maintain % Over 90% of fellowship applications submitted electronically	2008 Target of over 92.5% of fellowship applications submitted electronically	Over 92.5%	

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.

Table 2

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area IT	Measurement Grouping IT	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results

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

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

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:

(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: 4

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

(3) Systems in Planning - Security:

Name Of System	Agency Or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Planned or Actual C&A Completion Date

(4) Operational Systems - Security:

Name Of System	Agency Or Contractor Operated system	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact Level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has the C&A been completed using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards we used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Completed Security Control Testing	Date Contingency Plan Tested
FastLane	Contractor and Government	High	yes	12/13/05	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	09/05/06	02/16/06

(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? no

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

(6) Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? no

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

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

   NSF uses a range of methods to review the security of operations through contract requirements, project management oversight and review, certification and accreditation processes, IG independent reviews, proactive testing of controls through penetration testing and vulnerability scans to ensure services are adequately secure and meet the requirements of FISMA, OMB policy, NIST guidelines and NSF policy. The system is operated on-site by a team of contractors and NSF personnel with system administrators tightly controlling access to the systems. Only administrators with current need have access to the system, and strict code migration, quality control, and configuration management procedures prevent deployment of hostile or vulnerable software on the systems. Contractors are trained in the same security measures as NSF employees. All NSF employees and contract staff are required to complete an on-line

security training class each year, including the rules of behavior. Background checks are done routinely as a part of the NSF contracting process, and IT security requirements are stated in the contract's statement of work. Contractor security procedures are monitored, verified, and validated by the agency in the same way as for government employees. Once on board, contractors are allowed access to the NSF systems based on their specific job requirements. Audit logs are also implemented to monitor operating system changes - these audit logs are reviewed regularly by the system administrators. Additionally, roles and responsibilities are separated to the extent possible to allow for checks and balances in system management and multiple levels of oversight.

(8) Planning and Operational Systems - Privacy:

(a) Name Of System	(b) Is this a new system?	(c) Is there a PIA that covers this system?	(d) Is the PIA available to the public?	(e) Is a System Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	(t) Was a new or amended SORN published in FY06?
FastLane	no	1. Yes.	1. Yes.	yes	3. No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.

(c) Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?
1. Yes.
2. No.
3. No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.
4. No, because even though it has personal identifying information, the system contains information solely about federal employees and agency contractors.

(d) Is the PIA available to the public?
1. Yes.
2. No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.
3. No, because the PIA has not been prepared.

(0 Was a new or amended SORN published in FY2006?
1. Yes, because this is a newly established Privacy Act system of records.
2. Yes, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was substantially revised in FY 06.
3. No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.
4. No; the system is operational, but the SORN has not yet been published.
5. No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

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

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

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

(2) Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? no

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.	
b. If "no," please explain why?	While some functions of FastLane are planned for transition to the new Grants Management Line of Business (GMLOB) service center, that transition is part of another investment called NSF Research Portal.

(3) 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/.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEASRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal External Reuse (c)	Funding Percentage (d)
				Reused Service Component Name	Reused Service Component UPI		
FastLane	E Authentication	Customers Relationship Management	Partner Relationship Management	Identification and Authentication	422-00-01-04-04-0250-24	External	
FastLane	Grants.gov Integration	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management	Case Management	422-00-01-04-04-0160-24	External	
FastLane	PAS, Research Admin, Review, Panelist, Fellowship modules	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management			No Reuse	64
FastLane	Financial Functions	Financial Management	Payment / Settlement			No Reuse	12
FastLane	Populate Internal processing systems with grants transactions	Data Management	Loading and Archiving			No Reuse	12

FastLane	Research Admin User Management	Customer Relationship Management	Contact and Profile Management			No Reuse
FastLane	Research Admin Institution Profile	Customer Relationship Management	Customer / Account Management			No Reuse

(Note: a "3" appears at the right edge between the two rows above.)

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

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

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

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

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

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	**FEA TRM** Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	FEAService Specification (b)
Case Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Case Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity!	Java Database Connectivity (JDBC)
Case Management	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	Extensible Markup Language (XML)
Case Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	Java Server Pages (JSP)
Case Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML)
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Section 508
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	Internal (within agency)

Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Apache
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration, Management	Version Management, Defect Tracking, Issue Management, Change Management, Requirements Management and Traceability
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Functional Testing, Usability Testing (508 Testing), Performance Profiling, Load/Stress/Volume Testing, Security and Access Control Testing
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	Unified Modeling Language (UML)
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	Sun Solaris OS
Contact and Profile Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Macromedia JRun 4
Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Web Servers	Apache
Loading and Archiving	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Loading and Archiving	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Case Management	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Secure Sockets Layer (SSL)
Case Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML)

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

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

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

  a. If "yes," please describe.

  FastLane is integrated with Grants.gov for receipt of grant applications, and with E-Authentication for federated identity management.

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

(a) If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?   no

[1] 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).

PART III: For "Operation and Maintenance" Investments ONLY (Steady State)

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

Section A: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? yes
   a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?
07/01/2005
   b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? no
   c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?
   a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
   b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

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

Answer the following questions about how you are currently managing this investment.

1. Was an operational analysis conducted? yes
   a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed.
06/01/2005
   b. If "yes," what were the results? (Max 2500 Characters)

NSF has also instituted a number of performance management controls that ensure that system maintenance and operations activities stay on track. Performance management controls are included with the statements of work that are used for each project/task and are incorporated into any resulting contract. A detailed baseline plan is established at the beginning of maintenance activities and is used as a reference point throughout the lifecycle to plan, track, and control schedules, costs, and technical progress and identify any variances. NSF utilizes several mechanisms to ensure that there is an effective integration of task scope with schedule and cost elements for optimum task management and control. As a part of on-going task management, at a minimum, bi-weekly and monthly status reports are required for each task and contract. Reports include activities accomplished; activities planned to be completed; status of milestones; funds expended, to include projected costs compared to the estimate to complete the task; and risk/issues. Any variances with planned cost, technical, and 'schedule commitments are identified and management action is taken to resolve.

   c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct an operational analysis in the future? (Max 2500 Characters)

2. 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). Indicate if the information provided includes government and contractor costs:

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

Contractor Only

Description of Milestone (Max 50 Characters)	Planned		Actual		Baseline Schedule Variance (#Days)	Baseline Cost Variance ($M)
	Completion Date	Total Cost ($M)	Completion Date	Total Costs ($M)		
FY02 Steady State Operations	09/30/2002	$5.600	09/30/2002	$5.600		$0.000
FY03 Steady State Operations	09/30/2003	$5.700	09/30/2003	$5.700		$0.000
FY04 Steady State Operations	09/30/2004	$6.300	09/30/2004	$6.300		$0.000
FY05 Steady State Operations	09/30/2005	$4.400	09/30/2005	$4.400		$0.000
FY06 Steady State Operations	09/30/2006	$6.600	09/30/2006	$4.740		$1.860

Total Planned Costs   **Total Actual Costs:** $26.740