

**BY08 - Safe Drinking Water Information Systems (SDWIS)****INITIATIVE DEFINITION BY08***Initiative Definition BY08*

Template Name	IT Investment BY2008
Investment Name	BY08 - Safe Drinking Water Information Systems (SDWIS)
Investment Revision Number	6
Is this investment a consolidated business case?	No
Point of Contact	Job, Charles
Revision Comment	
Class	IT

**I.A: OVERVIEW BY08***Descriptive Information BY08*

Date of Submission	9/11/2006
Agency	Environmental Protection Agency
Bureau	Office of Water
Name of this Capital Asset	BY08 - Safe Drinking Water Information Systems (SDWIS)
Full UPI Code	020-00-01-12-01-1030-00
Four Digit UPI Code	1030
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	Goal 2 - Clean and Safe Water
PY Full UPI Code	020-00-01-12-01-1030-00-108-024
What kind of investment will this be in this Budget Year? Operations and Maintenance	
If this investment supports homeland security, Indicate by corresponding number which homeland security mission area(s) this investment supports?	
OMB Short Description	SDWIS supports the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act's Public Water System Supervision program and EPA's mission of protecting public health. SDWIS includes data collection, data analysis and data reporting to support national decision making.
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?	FY2001 or earlier
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:	SDWIS supports the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) program and EPA's mission of protecting public health. SDWIS includes data collection, storage, analysis and reporting in support of the decisionmaking by state and national program management. It provides decisionmakers with information on compliance with drinking water standards by water systems and information about the regulated systems. SDWIS is a legislatively required system supporting oversight and compliance determinations made by States and EPA programs that regulate approximately 160,000 public water systems providing drinking water to the American public.
SDWA mandates:	
-EPA develop and review regulations that protect the public from contaminants of concern in drinking water;	
-States implement the federal regulations, that control the activities of public water systems;	
-States report data to EPA to document their decisions about water system compliance and support EPA oversight and enforcement responsibilities; and	
-EPA fund (and oversee) the States' implementation activities, and where necessary, take enforcement	

actions against water systems, in lieu of or in addition to the States, to ensure compliance with regulations.

SDWIS was established to meet the PWSS program business need for a centralized database (under 40 CFR, Section 142.15) to collect reliable, timely, and accurate data from States. SDWIS addresses the end-to-end data flow for: submission of sample results by water systems to the states or EPA enforcement authority, state data management and reporting of high quality facility and violation results to EPA, and EPA receipt, processing and management of the data for decisionmaking and targeting actions to facilitate compliance. Benefits include reduced data submission, processing and reporting times with fewer errors.

The data from SDWIS allow the national PWSS Program to manage and implement SDWA, supporting EPA's Goal 2.1.1 - Water Safe to Drink. SDWIS provides a consistent central repository and tools needed to ensure that sound local and national program decisions are made on the best quality data.

Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	5/11/2006
Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes
Contact information of Project Manager?	
Project Manager Name	
Cottrill, Edward	
Project Manager Phone Number	202-564-4096
Project Manager E-mail	cottrill.edward@epa.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:	Expanded E-Government
Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit <a href="http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.">www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.</a> )	Yes
Does this investment address a weakness found during the PART Review?	Yes
If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?	Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF), Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) Grant Program,
If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?	Adequate
Is this investment for information technology?	Yes
Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?	To promote electronic data exchange, SDWIS supports end-to-end electronic data entry and reporting. SDWIS utilizes XML schemas, EPA data portal and State data Nodes. OGWDW and the states created a standard XML schema for sharing drinking water data. OGWDW works closely with the states in enhancing and maintaining SDWIS. SDWIS assists states and EPA in providing consistent drinking water quality data to the Public. EPA and the states are expanding the use of SDWIS data.

#### *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 Level 2 Guidance)

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?

If "yes," which FFMIA compliance area?

If "no," what does it address?

If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52

Provide the Percentage Financial Management for the budget year 0

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

For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for hardware? 0

For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for software? 0

For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for services? 100

For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for other services?

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

Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Privacy Officer Name

Hutt, Judy

Privacy Officer Phone Number 202-566-1668

Privacy Officer Title Agency Privacy Act Officer

Privacy Officer E-mail hutt.judy@epa.gov

Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? Yes

### ***I.B: SUMMARY OF SPENDING BY08***

#### ***Summary of Spending BY08***

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

SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT STAGES

\* Costs in thousands

	PY - 1 and Earlier	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 and Beyond	Total
<b>Planning</b>									
Budgetary Resources	4920	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	4920	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Preliminary Design</b>									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Contract Services</b>									
Budgetary Resources	4920	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	4920	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Acquisition</b>									
Budgetary Resources	36110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	36110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Development</b>									
Budgetary Resources	36110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	36110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Government FTE</b>									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Infrastructure Expenses</b>									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal Planning &amp; Acquisition</b>									
Budgetary Resources	41030	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	41030	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Operations &amp; Maintenance</b>									
Budgetary Resources	24160	3840	3620	2810			0	0	
Outlays	24160	3840	3620	2810			0	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>									
Budgetary Resources	65190	3840	3620	2810			0	0	
Outlays	65190	3840	3620	2810			0	0	
<b>Government FTE Costs</b>									
Budgetary Resources	12870	250	250	250			0	0	
<b>Planning</b>									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Acquisition</b>									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Maintenance</b>									
Budgetary Resources	12870	250	250	250			0	0	

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 Equivalentents BY08*

Use the following table to provide the number of Government Full Time Equivalentents (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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Security	0	0	0	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
Program Management	0	2	2	1.75	1.75	2	1	1	1									
IT	0	8	8	8	8	8	1	1	1									
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
Total*	0	10	10	10.00	10.00	10	2	2	2									

\*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?

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

Provide the Percent Budget Execution (BE) for the budget year

**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
Environmental Programs and Management (EPM):	DME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	3840	3620	2810									
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	3840	3620	2810									
On Ex.53: <b>Yes</b>																			
Total Yearly Budgets	DME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	3840	3620	2810									
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	3840	3620	2810									

**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	GS-10F-0206M	Global Environmental Consulting â€” System Support Contract â€” Small Business	Yes	2/14/2005	2/14/2005	9/30/2006	86	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	McElroy, Genine	202-564-4746 / MCElroy.genine@epa.gov	Level 2	Yes
2	GS-35F-015L	KeyLogic â€” SDWIS SETS/SNC â€” Small Business	Yes	10/1/2005	9/1/2005	9/30/2006	50	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Growney, Matthew	513-487-2029 / growney.matthew@epa.gov	Level 3	Yes
3	EP05W000459	Omni Systems â€” SDWIS Reports â€” Small Business	Yes	10/1/2004	10/1/2004	9/30/2006	100	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Wade, Valen	202-566-1690 / wade.valen@epa.gov	Level 2	Yes
4	DW-47-93939301-0, task 0502	CSC CDX SDWIS Task Order	Yes	6/1/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2008	100	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Pinskey, Lin	202-564-4394 / pinskey.lin@epa.gov	Level 3	Yes
5	NI6801040040	GSA Answer Contract SDWIS Task Order	Yes	7/1/2004	7/1/2004	6/30/2007	14318	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Clark, Robert	202-708-6416 / clark.robert@gsa.gov	Level 3	Yes
6	EP06D000567	Systalex â€” SDWIS support Task Order â€” Small Business	Yes	7/1/2006	7/31/2006	9/30/2007	3200	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Glass, Karen	919-541-1344 / glass.karen@epa.gov	Level 3	Yes

*Contract/Task Order Questions BY08*

If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:	
SDWIS is in steady-state and EVM is not required. We will require EVM for contracts supporting our SDWIS replacement system which will be initiated in FY 2010	
Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?	Yes
Explain why (508 Compliance)?	
Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?	Yes
What is the date of your acquisition plan?	5/25/2006
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)
2005	EPA Strategic Goal 2 – Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1 – Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1) – Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standards – Population	Sub-Objective 2.1.1: Percent of the population served by community water systems that receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through effective treatment and source water protection. This measure is calculated using information in SDWIS, and mainly assesses the performance of larger systems.	90 %	93 %	88.5%. A single very large system dropped the result by 2.3%.
2005	EPA Strategic Goal 2 – Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1 – Protect Public Health, OCFO APM -- Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standards – Systems	Sub-Objective 2.1.1: Percent of community water systems that receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through effective treatment and source water protection. This measure is calculated using	91.1 %	93 %	89.2%. New drinking water regulations took effect for smaller systems.

		information in SDWIS, and mainly assesses the performance of smaller systems.			
2005	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1)â€Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€Population and Systems	Percent utilization of SDWIS state module’s automated compliance determination modules, by states and other primacy agencies using this module to run their drinking water programs. The application of the modules enhances the efficient use of state resources. These modules consistently determine non-compliance with drinking water regulations. These automated determinations result in higher quality data for program oversight and the public.	48.1 %	Achieve the goal of 50% utilization by providing training and direct implementation assistance to state program offices	54.5%
2005	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1)â€Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€Population and Systems	National Water Programâ€FY2007 Guidance, Measure SDW#2: Indicator measure on SDWIS federal module’s data quality. Percent of the data for violations of health-based standards at public water systems that is complete and accurate in SDWIS. Data quality impacts the strategic goal results, enforcement oversight and information to the public on the safety of their drinking water.	64%, based on the prior triennial assessment.	90% of health-based violations are accurate and complete. This target is still under negotiation with the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators. We plan to calculate this annually in the future using the most recent 3 years of data.	77% based on the current (FY2006) triennial assessment.
2006	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective	Percent of compliance files (violations and Lead/Copper samples) sent by states and primacy	Historically SDWIS would receive 85 - 95% of the files on time.	100% of required compliance files received.	

	2.1.1)â€“Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€“Population and Systems	agencies to SDWIS each quarter. This measure tracks whether states and other primacy agencies are sending one or more compliance files to SDWIS on a quarterly basis. This impacts the timeliness in which EPA can perform enforcement oversight, and which the public can get information on the safety of their drinking water.			
2006	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€“Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€“Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1)â€“Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€“Population	Sub-Objective 2.1.1: Percent of the population served by community water systems that receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through effective treatment and source water protection. This measure is calculated using information in SDWIS, and mainly assesses the performance of larger systems.	88.5 %	93 %	Will be calculated in October 2006
2006	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€“Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€“Protect Public Health, OCFO APM--Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€“Systems	Sub-Objective 2.1.1: Percent of community water systems that receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through effective treatment and source water protection. This measure is calculated using information in SDWIS, and mainly assesses the performance of smaller systems.	89.2 %	93.5 %	Will be calculated in October 2006
2006	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€“Clean and Safe Water, Strategic	Percent utilization of SDWIS state module's	54.5 %	Achieve the goal of 60% utilization by providing	

	Objective 1 – “Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1) – “Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standards” – Population and Systems	automated compliance determination modules, by states and other primacy agencies using this module to run their drinking water programs. The application of the modules enhances the efficient use of state resources. These modules consistently determine non-compliance with drinking water regulations. These automated determinations result in higher quality data for program oversight and the public.		training and direct implementation assistance to state program offices	
2006	EPA Strategic Goal 2 – “Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1 – “Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1) – “Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standards” – Population and Systems	National Water Program – “FY2007 Guidance, Measure SDW#2: Indicator measure on SDWIS federal module’s data quality. Percent of the data for violations of health-based standards at public water systems that is complete and accurate in SDWIS. Data quality impacts the strategic goal results, enforcement oversight and information to the public on the safety of their drinking water.	77 %	90% of health-based violations are accurate and complete. This target is still under negotiation with the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators. We plan to calculate this annually in the future using the most recent 3 years of data.	
2007	EPA Strategic Goal 2 – “Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1 – “Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1) – “Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standards” – Population	Sub-Objective 2.1.1: Percent of the population served by community water systems that receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through effective treatment and source water	93% (2006 Target)	94 %	Will be calculated in October 2007

		protection. This measure is calculated using information in SDWIS, and mainly assesses the performance of larger systems.			
2007	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€”Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€”Protect Public Health, OCFO APM--Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€”Systems	Sub-Objective 2.1.1: Percent of community water systems that receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through effective treatment and source water protection. This measure is calculated using information in SDWIS, and mainly assesses the performance of smaller systems.	93.5% (2006 Target)	94 %	Will be calculated in October 2007
2007	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€”Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€”Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1)â€”Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€”Population and Systems	Percent utilization of SDWIS state module's automated compliance determination modules, by states and other primacy agencies using this module to run their drinking water programs. The application of the modules enhances the efficient use of state resources. These modules consistently determine non-compliance with drinking water regulations. These automated determinations result in higher quality data for program oversight and the public.	60 % (2006 Target)	Achieve the goal of 70% utilization by providing training and direct implementation assistance to state program offices	
2007	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€”Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€”Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1)â€”Safe Drinking Water Meeting All	National Water Programâ€”FY2007 Guidance, Measure SDW#2: Indicator measure on SDWIS federal module's data quality. Percent of	77 %	90% of health-based violations are accurate and complete. This target is still under negotiation with the Association of	

	Standardsâ€™Population and Systems	the data for violations of health-based standards at public water systems that is complete and accurate in SDWIS. Data quality impacts the strategic goal results, enforcement oversight and information to the public on the safety of their drinking water.		State Drinking Water Administrators. We plan to calculate this annually in the future using the most recent 3 years of data.	
2007	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€™Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€™Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1)â€™Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€™Population and Systems	Percent of compliance files (violations and Lead/Copper samples) sent by states and primacy agencies to SDWIS each quarter. This measure tracks whether states and other primacy agencies are sending one or more compliance files to SDWIS on a quarterly basis. This impacts the timeliness in which EPA can perform enforcement oversight, and which the public can get information on the safety of their drinking water.	Historically SDWIS would receive 85 - 95% of the files on time.	100% of required compliance files received.	
2008	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€™Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€™Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1)â€™Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€™Population	Sub-Objective 2.1.1: Percent of the population served by community water systems that receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through effective treatment and source water protection. This measure is calculated using information in SDWIS, and mainly assesses the performance of larger systems.	94% (2007 Target)	95 %	Will be calculated in October 2008

2008	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€Protect Public Health, OCFO APM--Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€Systems	Sub-Objective 2.1.1: Percent of community water systems that receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through effective treatment and source water protection. This measure is calculated using information in SDWIS, and mainly assesses the performance of smaller systems.	94% (2007 Target)	95 %	Will be calculated in October 2008
2008	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1)â€Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€Population and Systems	Percent utilization of SDWIS state module’s automated compliance determination modules, by states and other primacy agencies using this module to run their drinking water programs. The application of the modules enhances the efficient use of state resources. These modules consistently determine non-compliance with drinking water regulations. These automated determinations result in higher quality data for program oversight and the public.	70 % (2007 Target)	Achieve the goal of 75% utilization by providing training and direct implementation assistance to state program offices	
2008	EPA Strategic Goal 2â€Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1â€Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1)â€Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standardsâ€Population and Systems	National Water Programâ€FY2007 Guidance, Measure SDW#2: Indicator measure on SDWIS federal module’s data quality. Percent of the data for violations of health-based standards at public water systems that is complete and accurate in SDWIS. Data	90 % (2007 Target)	95% of health-based violations are accurate and complete. This target is still under negotiation with the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators. We plan to calculate this annually in the future using the most recent 3	

		quality impacts the strategic goal results, enforcement oversight and information to the public on the safety of their drinking water.		years of data.	
2008	EPA Strategic Goal 2 – Clean and Safe Water, Strategic Objective 1 – Protect Public Health, APG 2.1 (Sub Objective 2.1.1) – Safe Drinking Water Meeting All Standards – Population and Systems	Percent of compliance files (violations and Lead/Copper samples) sent by states and primacy agencies to SDWIS each quarter. This measure tracks whether states and other primacy agencies are sending one or more compliance files to SDWIS on a quarterly basis. This impacts the timeliness in which EPA can perform enforcement oversight, and which the public can get information on the safety of their drinking water..	Historically SDWIS would receive 85 - 95% of the files on time.	100% of required compliance files received.	

*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
-------------	-----------------------------	------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	----------------

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](http://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 **7**

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
----------------	--	--------------------------	---------------------------------------

*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
Safe Drinking Water Information System/	Government Only	High	Yes	8/23/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/18/2006	3/18/2006

*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?

*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?
Safe Drinking Water Information System	No	No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	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? No

If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

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

SDWIS is not included in EPA's most recent Transition Strategy and Sequencing Plan because that plan focused exclusively on Investments in Development, Modernization or Enhancement phases that planned to use EPA's Central Service Components.

*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
Central Data Exchange	EPA's exchange network for uploading and publishing data between trading partners	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange	Data Exchange	020-00-01-16-01-6005-00-404-142	Internal	3
SDWIS's validation module - a data validation tool to provide near real-time quality checking	A suite of tools that, for primacy agencies (PA) using SDWIS's state module, extracts data from their database and formats into XML documents. PA's not using SDWIS are responsible for creating XML documents consistent with our published XML schema.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Extraction and Transformation			No Reuse	2

	For all primacy agencies, validates the XML document against EPA business rules, provides output reports. Provides capability for user to manage validated XML documents and interfaces with EPA's CDX to transfer data reports to EPA.							
SDWIS's national database - a database receiving, processing and storing routine state data submittals	central repository designed to complete primacy agency data submittal validations not performed in FedRep, provides output reports recording data submittal results, stores the resulting data for ultimate migration to the data warehouse for end user retrieval	Back Office Services	Data Management	Loading and Archiving			No Reuse	12
Drinking Water Data Warehouse - a national repository of summary and exception data submitted by states to support EPA decision making stored from which the centrally managed national data are made available to various tools that	The Drinking Water Data Warehouse contains all the data extracted from SDWIS's national operational database, denormalized the data to make it more accessible for user retrievals. This data is used by the SDWIS Reporting Services (SRS) Standard Reports.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Data Integration			No Reuse	5

generate reports								
SDWIS's state module - State data repositories, a suite of software tools supporting SDWA compliance decision making and data submission of the States	A suite of applications designed to assist primacy agencies in performing their Public Water System Supervision responsibilities, including a database, data entry screens for interactive data update, processes for batch updating data (such as lab sample data), processes to analyze data and provide sampling schedules, identify noncompliance, allow users to validate noncompliance, develop and track enforcement and other actions; and schedule, perform and document visits and inspections.	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Decision Support and Planning			No Reuse	40
Drinking Water Data Warehouse - a national repository of summary and exception data submitted by states to support EPA decision making stored from which the centrally managed national data are made available to various	A central repository designed to complete primacy agency data submittal validations not performed in SDWIS's validation module, provides output reports recording data submittal results, stores the resulting data for ultimate migration to the data warehouse for	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	3

tools that generate reports	end user retrieval							
Drinking Water Data Warehouse - a national repository of summary and exception data submitted by states to support EPA decision making stored from which the centrally managed national data are made available to various tools that generate reports	The Drinking Water Data Warehouse contains all the data extracted from SDWIS's national operational database, denormalized the data to make it more accessible for user retrievals. This data is used by the SDWIS Reporting Services (SRS) Standard Reports.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	OLAP			No Reuse	3
Drinking Water Data Warehouse - a national repository of summary and exception data submitted by states to support EPA decision making stored from which the centrally managed national data are made available to various tools that generate reports	The Drinking Water Data Warehouse contains all the data extracted from SDWIS's national operational database, denormalized the data to make it more accessible for user retrievals. This data is used by the SDWIS Reporting Services (SRS) Standard Reports.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	10
SDWIS's validation module - a data validation tool to provide near real-time quality checking	A suite of tools that, for primacy agencies (PA) using SDWIS's state module, extracts data from their database and	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	3

	<p>formats into XML documents. PA's not using SDWIS are responsible for creating XML documents consistent with our published XML schema. For all primacy agencies, validates the XML document against EPA business rules, provides output reports. Provides capability for user to manage validated XML documents and interfaces with EPA's CDX to transfer data reports to EPA.</p>							
<p>SDWIS's validation module - a data validation tool to provide near real-time quality checking</p>	<p>A suite of tools that, for primacy agencies (PA)using SDWIS's state module, extracts data from their database and formats into XML documents. PA's not using SDWIS are responsible for creating XML documents consistent with our published XML schema. For all primacy agencies, validates the XML document against EPA business rules, provides output reports. Provides capability for user to manage validated XML documents and interfaces with</p>	<p>Digital Asset Services</p>	<p>Document Management</p>	<p>Document Review and Approval</p>			<p>No Reuse</p>	<p>5</p>

	EPA's CDX to transfer data reports to EPA.							
SDWIS's national operational database - a database receiving, processing and storing routine state data submittals	A central repository designed to complete primacy agency data submittal validations not performed in SDWIS's validation module, provides output reports recording data submittal results, stores the resulting data for ultimate migration to the data warehouse for end user retrieval	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing			No Reuse	1
SDWIS's validation module - a data validation tool to provide near real-time quality checking	A suite of tools that, for primacy agencies (PA)using SDWIS's state module, extracts data from their database and formats into XML documents. PA's not using SDWIS are responsible for creating XML documents consistent with our published XML schema. For all primacy agencies, validates the XML document against EPA business rules, provides output reports. Provides capability for user to manage validated XML documents and interfaces with EPA's CDX to	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	1

	transfer data reports to EPA.							
SDWIS's state module - State data repositories, a suite of software tools supporting SDWA compliance decision making and data submission of the States	A suite of applications designed to assist primacy agencies in performing their Public Water System Supervision responsibilities, including a database, data entry screens for interactive data update, processes for batch updating data (such as lab sample data), processes to analyze data and provide sampling schedules, identify noncompliance, allow users to validate noncompliance, develop and track enforcement and other actions; and schedule, perform and document visits and inspections.	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	12

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)
Decision Support	Component	Business Logic	Platform	

and Planning	Framework		Dependent	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Document Review and Approval	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
OLAP	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Ad Hoc	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Extraction and Transformation	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Data Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	
Loading and Archiving	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	

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

**FEA Primary Mapping BY08**

FEA Primary Mapping  
 Reference Model: BRM  
 Business Area: Services For Citizens  
 Line of Business: Environmental Management  
 Sub Function: Environmental Remediation  
 Mapping Code: 108024

**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?

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

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
-------------	----------------------	----------------------------	--	---

*Selected Alternative BY08*

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

What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

**II.B: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08**

*Risk Management Plan BY08*

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

Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?  Yes

What is the date of the risk management plan?  3/28/2006

Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

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:

**II.C: COST AND SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE BY08**

*Earned Value BY08*

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

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)?

What is the Earned Value (EV)?

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

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

EVMS "As of" date:

What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI) =

EV/PV)?

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

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

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

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

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

**Cost/Schedule Variance BY08**

Is the CV% or SV% greater than 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)

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"?

**Performance Baseline BY08**

Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year?

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			
<b>Project</b>										

**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? 3/28/2006

Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

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? Yes  
 If "yes," provide the date the operational analysis was completed. 3/31/2006

Please provide a brief summary of the operational analysis results.

Based on our operational analysis, we are meeting or exceeding our goals. With SDWIS, we addressed our performance gaps. Specifically, we have ensured that EPA analysts have consistent and reliable data at the national level to evaluate program implementation and make recommendation to the decision makers. We have for the first time had all state drinking water programs submit required quarterly drinking water data on schedule. We have provided states a tool (SDWIS's state module) that allows states to consistently determine compliance for the drinking water regulations. Our ongoing challenge is to expand the use of SDWIS's state module. After hurricanes Katrina and Rita, EPA and some of our state partners provided remote IT support to enable Louisiana to graphically analyze their drinking water infrastructure, thus resulting in more effective allocation of limited state program resources. Louisiana's usage of SDWIS's state module as their primary state drinking water information system allowed them to tap into the resources of other state offices, specifically New York. These circumstances have allowed us to identify other capabilities for SDWIS's state module to make it more useful to decision-makers. Our analysis of the SDWIS system continues to show that our partnership with state and tribal program offices is effective in meeting the goal of protecting public health.

If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:

*Performance Baseline BY08*

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

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

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date	Total Cost	Completion Date	Total Cost	Schedule (# days)	Cost
38	2005 Total	09/30/2005	\$4.550	09/30/2005	\$4.608	0	(\$0.058)
1	SDWIS User Support and Training FY 05	09/30/2005	\$0.850	09/30/2005	\$0.812	0	\$0.038
2	Management of SDWIS Projects FY 05	09/30/2005	\$0.500	09/30/2005	\$0.421	0	\$0.079
3	Maintenance of SDWIS's Production Control, National database, validation module, Documentation FY 05	09/30/2005	\$1.400	09/30/2005	\$1.493	0	(\$0.093)
4	Modification to SDWIS to Support Safe Drinking Water Act regulations	09/30/2005	\$1.800	09/30/2005	\$1.882	0	(\$0.082)
39	2006 Total	09/30/2006	\$4.090	09/30/2006	\$1.555	0	\$2.535
5	Maintenance of SDWIS Support FY 06	09/30/2006	\$0.380				
6	SDWIS User Support and Training FY 06	09/30/2006	\$0.500				
7	Operation of SDWIS National DB FY 06	09/30/2006	\$0.490				
8	Management of SDWIS Projects FY 06	09/30/2006	\$0.400				
9	Modification to SDWIS to Support Safe Drinking Water Act regulations for Web Release 1	04/30/2006	\$0.600	03/30/2006	\$0.585	31	\$0.015
13	SDWIS's state module web Release 2 FY 06	09/30/2006	\$0.500				
40	SDWIS WCF	09/30/2006	\$0.970	09/30/2006	\$0.970	0	\$0.000
45	EPA FTE PM 2006	09/30/2006	\$0.250				
41	2007 Total	09/30/2007	\$3.870				
10	Modification to SDWIS to Support Safe Drinking Water Act regulations Web Release 2	06/30/2007	\$0.000				
11	Maintenance of SDWIS's state module (including electronic Data Verification and electronic Lab sample reporting to States) FY 07	09/30/2007	\$0.400				
12	SDWIS User Support and Training FY 07	09/30/2007	\$0.500				

15	Enhance data validation module to meet new rule requirements	06/30/2007	\$0.150				
16	Operation of SDWIS National DB (w/WCF)	09/30/2007	\$0.870				
17	Maintenance of SDWIS Warehouse	09/30/2007	\$0.150				
18	Maintenance of SDWIS Reports	09/30/2007	\$0.150				
19	Maintenance of SDWIS SNC/SETS module	09/30/2007	\$0.150				
46	EPA FTE PM 2007	09/30/2007	\$0.250				
42	2008 Total	09/30/2008	\$3.060				
20	Maintenance of SDWIS' state module FY 08	09/30/2008	\$0.650				
21	SDWIS User Support and Training FY 08	09/30/2008	\$0.650				
22	Maintenance of data validation module)	09/30/2008	\$0.250				
23	Operation of SDWIS National DB (w/WCF) 08	09/30/2008	\$0.660				
24	Maintenance of SDWIS Warehouse 08	09/30/2008	\$0.150				
25	Maintenance SDWIS Reports 08	09/30/2008	\$0.200				
26	Maintain SDWIS SNC/SETS module 08	09/30/2008	\$0.200				
27	Initiate closeout of SDWIS SYSTEM	09/30/2008	\$0.050				
47	EPA FTE PM 2008	09/30/2008	\$0.250				
43							

**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?

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

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
-------------	----------------------	----------------------------	--	---

*Selected Alternative BY08*

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

What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

*Quantitative Benefits BY08*

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

Federal Quantitative Benefits

	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Cost Avoidance
PY - 6 2000	0	0		
PY - 5 2001	0	0		
PY - 4 2002	0	0		
PY - 3 2003	0	0		

PY - 2 2004	0	0		
PY - 1 2005	0	0		
PY 2006	0	0		
CY 2007	0	0		
BY 2008	0	0		
BY + 1 2009	0	0		
BY + 2 2010	0	0		
BY + 3 2011	0	0		
BY + 4 2012	0	0		
BY + 5 2013	0	0		
BY + 6 2014	0	0		
BY + 7 2015	0	0		
BY + 8 2016	0	0		
Total LLC Benefit	0	0		

**IV.B: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08**

*Risk Management Plan BY08*

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

Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes

What is the date of the risk management plan? 3/28/2006

Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes

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:

**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.

Are you using EVM to manage this investment?

If "no," explain plans to implement EVM:

Please provide a brief summary of the operational analysis results.

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

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

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

EVMS "As of" date:

What is the Planned Value (PV)?

What is the Earned Value (EV)?

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

*Cost/Schedule Variance BY08*

Is the CV% or SV% greater than 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)

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"?

*Performance Baseline BY08*

Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year?

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?

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.

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				
<b>Project</b>											