

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary**Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)****Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)**

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Date of Submission: | 9/15/2008 |
| 2. Agency: | Environmental Protection Agency |
| 3. Bureau: | Office Of Administration And Resources Management |
| 4. Name of this Capital Asset: | EPA Acquisition System (EAS) |
| 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) | 020-00-01-16-01-0231-00 |
| 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) | Full Acquisition |
| 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? | FY2007 |
| 8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap: | |
| <p>The EPA Acquisition System (EAS) investment will close the EPA identified performance gap in invoice and payment alignment by implementing an intranet-based, Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) system to support the EPA acquisition community. The EAS will replace three current EPA systems; Office of Acquisition Management (OAM) Small Purchases Electronic Data Interchange System (SPEDI), Integrated Contracts Management System (ICMS) and Project Office Interface (POI). The EAS will integrate with the EPA financial system to provide end-to-end functionality from program office acquisition requests through simplified acquisition and/or large contract processing, reporting, invoice review, and close out. Integrated functionality is necessary to close the EPA identified performance gap in invoice and payment alignment.</p> <p>The EAS will provide remote access over the internet or intranet through an EPA standard secure connection. Buyers, Contract Specialists, Contracting Officers and Requisitioners in the EPA Regions, Headquarters Units, and Laboratories will link to the application through the EPA Portal and use the integrated acquisition and financial systems to create and manage contracts and purchases. The EAS will enable the acquisition community to perform acquisition and business functions in a streamlined, secure, real time response to support mission needs of the program offices. The EAS will provide acquisition related financial and management information in real-time to enable program managers throughout EPA to aggressively manage mission critical programs and improve internal and external reporting. Configurable workflows within the COTS system will enable local management of acquisition activities based upon performance criteria and appropriate policies configured into the system. The EAS will provide access to and more efficient use of the Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE) shared system inventory and other external tools. The IAE is an E-Government initiative of the President's Management Agenda (PMA) that improves acquisition data quality through use of shared components to standardize data and processes. Currently, EPA bears the cost of coding and reprogramming of required ongoing modifications to maintain compliance with legislative and IAE changes. The EAS vendor will be responsible for bearing the cost for required updates, modifications, or changes to the COTS application which reduces costs to the EPA.</p> | |
| 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? | Yes |
| a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? | 8/28/2008 |
| 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? | Yes |
| 11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager? | |
| Name | |
| Phone Number | |
| Email | |
| a. What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the program/project manager? | Waiver Issued |
| b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned? | 3/22/2006 |
| c. What date did the Program/Project Manager receive the FAC-P/PM certification? If the certification has not been issued, what is the anticipated date for certification? | 8/28/2009 |

Exhibit 300: EPA Acquisition System (EAS) (Revision 10)

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?	Yes
a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	Yes
b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	No
1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	
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 directly support one of the PMA initiatives?	Yes
If "yes," check all that apply:	Expanded E-Government
a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s) (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)	EAS directly supports the PMA initiative for Expanded eGovernment (eGov). ICMS supports this initiative by use of shared government-wide systems that comprise the Integrated Acquisition Environment, one of twenty-four PMA eGov initiatives. EAS increases access to data, minimizes burden upon acquisition personnel, reduces duplicative acquisition efforts and process durations, and contributes to improved contractor performance in support of EPA's acquisition goals and objectives.
14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part .)	No
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?	Yes
If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.	
For information technology investments only:	
16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	Level 2
17. In addition to the answer in 11(a), 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 or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)	No
19. Is this a financial management system?	Yes
a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFIA compliance area?	Yes
1. If "yes," which compliance area:	Federal financial management systems requirements
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	
EPA Acquisition System (EAS)	
20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)	
Hardware	2
Software	60
Services	38

- Other 0
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
- Phone Number
- Title
- E-mail
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? Yes
- Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:
24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? No

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

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

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	2.3	2.3	1.2	0					
Acquisition:	1.7	3.7	4.8	0.638					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	4.0	6.0	6.0	0.638					
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0	0	0.979					
TOTAL:	4.0	6.0	6.0	1.617					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0.589	0.314	0.346	1					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	4	3	3	6					

Note: For the multi-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?
- a. If "yes," How many and in what year?
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: Change in PY 2008 reflects Agency reduction of budget request by \$1,000,000. Increase in FY 2010 and beyond reflects costs deferred from BY2008, increased training EPA wide and EPA wide use of the requisition module.

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

1. 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.

Exhibit 300: EPA Acquisition System (EAS) (Revision 10)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	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 (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N)
EP07H002337	Fixed price and fixed rate performance based - SBA 8(a) Certified	Yes	8/18/2007	8/18/2007	12/31/2009	3.101	Yes	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes				
EP W 07 100	Fixed price and fixed rate performance based	Yes	9/26/2007	9/27/2007	12/31/2012	13.64	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes				

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

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done? The COTS product selected as the basis for EAS has successfully met Section 508 compliance standards at other federal agencies, including NASA and Energy. The COTS product vendor provided a VPAT that addresses all parts of the Section 508 and explains how its COTS product complies with each standard or part. Results of implementation and testing of this COTS product at other agencies is being reviewed to determine extent of independent validation needed.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date? 3/2/2007

1. Is it Current? Yes

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

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

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Number of days to respond to Vendor Questions to EAS RFP	20 Days	15 Days	15 Days
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Supply Chain Management	Services Acquisition	Lead time for EAS Procurement Package	200 Days	180 Days	180 Days
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Timeliness	Number of days in preparation of EAS Procurement Package	200 Days	180 Days	180 Days
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Efficiency	System Response Time	Number of days in preparation of Functional and Technical Requirements for EAS RFP	80 Days	80 Days	80 Days
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Number of days to create Computer Based Training	90 Days	90 Days	9/30/2008
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Supply Chain Management	Services Acquisition	Number of days to build-out EAS environments	120 Days	120 Days	9/30/2008
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Risk	Number of strategies created	21 strategies	26 strategies	9/30/2008
2008	Cross-Goal	Technology	Information and	Data Storage	Number of Days	120 Days	120 Days	9/30/2008

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Strategies		Data		to Complete Data Migration planning			
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Percentage of Users trained and using the system	80%	80%	9/30/2009
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Supply Chain Management	Services Acquisition	Percentage of test scripts successful during User Acceptance testing	80%	80%	9/30/2009
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Percentage of functional requirements available at go-live for new system	95%	100 %	9/30/2009
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Information and Data	Data Storage	Percentage of active contracts available post data migration	80%	100%	9/30/2009
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Percentage of satisfied customers per Satisfaction Surveys	75%	78%	9/30/2010
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Sharing	Average Number of Days to complete Contract Award	90 days	89 days	9/30/2010
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Efficiency	Average number of contracts awarded per Contract Officer per year	5	6	9/30/2010
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Percentage of days providing 24/7 EAS availability	92%	93%	9/30/2010

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 5
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part Yes

of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment?

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
EPA Acquisition System (EAS)	Government Only	1/1/2010	12/15/2009

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A)	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested

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, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain 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?

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
EPA Acquisition System (EAS)	Yes	Yes	http://www.epa.gov/privacy/assess/eas.htm	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

Details for Text Options:
 Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.
 Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.
 Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

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

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

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

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? Yes
 a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. EPA Acquisition System (EAS)
 b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved No segment architecture?

a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>.

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
IAE Federal Procurement Data System Next Generation (FPDS-NG)	Machine to machine reporting from EAS to FPDS-NG with reports and information available from the FPDS-NG system	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange	Data Exchange	023-30-01-02-01-0230-24	External	1
Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE)	Provide shared services to support the entire acquisition lifecycle in unified manner by leveraging govt-wide, existing technology/acquisition infrastructures (ie eAuthentication & Central Contractor Registry (CCR)), and to balance needs and funding, and manage phased development.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Data Integration	Procurement	023-30-01-02-01-0230-24	External	1
EPA Acquisition System contract execution	Activities to monitor contract requirements including technical and other requirements such as subcontract goals, socioeconomic considerations, use of earned value management reported information	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Performance Management			No Reuse	24
EPA Acquisition System Requirements Management	Activities required to provide the proposed solution and monitor use of requirements for an acquisition.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Requirements Management			No Reuse	23
Central Contractor Registry (CCR) part of Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE)	Establish and manage vendor information - standardized and consistent throughout the federal government. CCR is the where contractors enter their information. Vendors must be in CCR to receive	Business Management Services	Supply Chain Management	Catalog Management	Partner Relationship Management	023-30-01-02-01-0230-24	External	1

Exhibit 300: EPA Acquisition System (EAS) (Revision 10)

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table: Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	award.							
EPA Acquisition System contract creation	Create contract, maintain customer information, validate authorization to do business, leverage Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE) Central Contractor Registry (CCR), Federal Procurement Data System Next Generation (FPDS-NG), Manage Customer interaction	Business Management Services	Supply Chain Management	Ordering / Purchasing			No Reuse	25
Acquisition Action Information Sharing	Activities that gather data and provide indications of a particular process or product. Includes filtering or logical analysis of the data and presentation in real time of actions within the system.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery			No Reuse	25

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

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

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

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

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table: 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	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Requirements Management	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Ordering / Purchasing	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Catalog Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	
Data Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	

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

Exhibit 300: EPA Acquisition System (EAS) (Revision 10)

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

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

The EPA Acquisition System (EAS) will leverage the thirteen listed components from the Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE), an e-Gov initiative that provides improved data quality listed below.

- Central Contractor Registration (CCR)

The CCR permits the EAS to leverage the government wide standardization of vendor data managed by the General Services Administration. The CCR also saves the vendors effort as they input their data only once rather than at each agency. The EAS will use a subset of the CCR data and will not be required to build or provide vendor information input tables.

- EPA/EAS use of the centrally maintained databases and systems listed below (also referred to as components) will permit the EAS investment to avoid the costs of building and maintaining similar components and/or will provide substantial benefit from the standardization of process or data that use of the component provides.

Excluded Parties List System (EPLS)

Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS)

Federal Business Opportunities (FBO)

Federal Agency Registration (FedReg)

Federal Technical Data solutions (FedTeds)

Federal Procurement Data Systems (FPDS-NG)

Financial Management Service (FMS) Treasury Offset Program (TOP)

JWOD for required buys

Online Representations and Certification Application (ORCA)

Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS)

VetBiz.gov

Wage Determinations Online (WDOL)

Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

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.

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? 7/16/2007
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results:			
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:			* Costs in millions
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Alternative 1 - Buy an Acquisition COTS	Purchase a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) integrated acquisition and contract writing system built to federal acquisition standards and aligned with PMA and agency goals. Replace and retire all legacy sub-systems.	33.696	63.431
Alternative 2 - Upgrade, re-engineer, enhance major legacy application	Upgrade, re-engineer, enhance, and integrate ICMS, SPEDI, and POI to meet EAS Functional and Technical Requirements. Business processes already well defined individually in ICMS, SPEDI, and POI will be leveraged to accelerate the re-engineering, enhancement, and integration activities needed to satisfy EAS requirements.	47.46	51.054
Alternative 3 - Government off-the-shelf (GOTS) application software	EPA Acquisition System (EAS) Utilizing Government off-the-shelf (GOTS) application software. For the purpose of the CBA, the HCAS at Health and Human Services (HHS) was chosen as the most viable GOTS solution. HHS permits the interface of HCAS with the financial system the client Federal agency selects to use and leverages the capability of the client Federal agency s financial system.	171.376	172.291
Status Quo	Continue with the current systems: the Integrated Contracts Management System (ICMS), Small Purchase Electronic Data Interchange (SPEDI), and the Program Office Interface (POI).	27.961	0

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?
 Alternative 1, Implement a COTS Solution. The COTS solution provides the greatest economic advantage (highest ROI of 188.24%, highest Lifecycle NPV of \$29.735M). In addition, it can be implemented with the lowest risk of the alternatives by FY10 when the ICMS and SPEDI systems will be retired.

COTS solutions are readily available in the marketplace. The COTS system implementations have allowed a number of other Federal agencies to efficiently and effectively enhance their acquisition capabilities, increase productivity, and dynamically interface with Financial and other requisite administrative systems. Moreover, these COTS solutions have improved ad hoc and small business utilization and other reporting capabilities, greater accountability at the program and task levels, facilitated dynamic interfaces with FPDS-NG, and improved compliance with Federal acquisition guidelines and standards.

Alternative 1 can be managed and maintained by current federal employees and support for updates to the system to comply with legislation or changes to IAE requirements will be provided by the commercial vendor. Costs of changes to the systems will be shared among the agencies that use the COTS software and this will permit EPA to stay current with the legislation and any changes to the Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE).

- a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.)
4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Exhibit 300: EPA Acquisition System (EAS) (Revision 10)

EAS will provide greater coordination, integration, and dissemination of acquisition policy, standards, and procedures. There will be greater ability of the contracting workforce to move from one part of the agency to another or even from one agency to another as agencies move to commercial solutions that provide a standard or basic set of required actions and tools. The shared knowledge of the COTS system provides opportunities for government wide management of the acquisition workforce. In addition, program office confidence will be improved with the increased reliability of the system and decreased lead time on awards. The COTS system components standardize appropriate segments of the acquisition process and that improves data quality and enhances visibility of Agency spending by a Qualitative Benefit of 4.45%.

The COTS solution leverages and does not duplicate the Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE) databases or systems. The COTS solution will provide real time financial data related to acquisitions through seamless integration of financial and procurement systems. This, in turn, will enable program managers to more effectively manage their program dollars and also provide them the information required for performance based budgeting. This will result in a Qualitative Benefit of a 7.29% increase in program management cost control.

The COTS solution permits a projected 12% Qualitative Benefit increase on overall OAM acquisition workforce productivity and efficiency. The increased OAM acquisition workforce productivity and efficiency are positive results of improved data integrity and access, elimination of excessively redundant data entry and data entry into disparate systems. Further, these positive results will decrease contract award lead time, provide for more efficient and verifiable contract close out and improve integration of acquisition policies, coordination, and dissemination. Ultimately, the COCTS solution enables the OAM acquisition workforce to increase the volume of awards processed without experiencing additional burden.

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits				
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:				
	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY - 1 2007 & Prior	0	0		
PY 2008	0	0		
CY 2009	0	0		
BY 2010	8.878	0	EPA Acquisition Community will benefit from achieved productively gains as a result of improved data quality, integrity and availability. Management will benefit from oversight efficiency gains as a result of increased systems reliability brought about through integration of all IAE shared systems and real-time access to financial databases. The value of these cost savings is projected to increase by .67% annually through the remaining system lifecycle.	
Total LCC Benefit		0	LCC = Life-cycle Cost	

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

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

5b. List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
Integrated Contracts Management System (ICMS)	020-00-01-16-01-6013-00	12/31/2010
Project Office Interface (POI)	020-00-01-16-01-6013-00	12/31/2010
Small Purchase Electronic Data Interchange (SPEDI)	020-00-01-16-01-6013-00	12/31/2010

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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

- 1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 6/30/2008
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

The Risk Management Plan has been updated to include changes that help the EAS team identify, assess, mitigate, and manage risks throughout the life cycle of the project. The EAS team has developed a Risk Management Model that objectively assesses

risks based on their probability of occurrence and their overall impact on the project. The primary objective of the updates to the Risk Management Plan is to take a proactive approach to providing current information on how to assess risks, assign responsibility, formulate mitigation strategies, and make decisions in an objective manner. The new plan also explains how each team lead must manage risks for their pertinent area of work, as well as how risks roll up to the EAS Project Manager for total visibility of risks in all areas of the project. The EAS Project also has developed a separate document that specifically addresses how the COTS vendor, Compusearch, will manage risks associated with the implementation of EAS. Risks identified by the vendor roll up into the overall EAS Risk Management Ledger.

The EAS project underwent an Independent Baseline Review (IBR) during the months of April and May of 2008. During the IBR, five (5) categories of risks (cost, schedule, technical, resource, and management process) were assessed for each project milestone. These risks and their associated mitigation strategies and triggers have been included in the overall EAS Risk Management Ledger for continuous review and monitoring.

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?

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

Lifecycle cost and benefit estimates have been "risk adjusted". Project risks are identified, evaluated, and prioritized. When a risk is identified, it is entered in the EAS Risk Management Ledger for scoring and tracking. The risk is evaluated in two areas: (a) probability of occurrence; and (b) impact to the project. Each risk area is scored as high, medium, or low. Adjustments to cost/benefit estimates due to risks are as follows:

First, all risks are prioritized. Areas are assigned scores as numerical values where high = 3; medium = 2; and low = 1. Prioritization is done by multiplying the probability by the impact. As example: a risk with high probability (3) and high impact (3) would result in an overall score of 9, the highest score a risk can receive. This would be a risk of an urgent nature that would require immediate attention and mitigation.

Cost/benefit estimates are adjusted based on scoring using percentile values where high = 5%; medium = 3%; and low = 1%. Cost adjustments are increased by determining the adjustment factor. Using the previous example, a risk with high probability (5%) and high impact (5%) would result in a 25% increase to the cost estimate. Benefit estimates are decreased using the same formula that is used to calculate the cost adjustments.

Some risks are deemed "schedule risks" and can significantly impact the project schedule. Schedule risk is adjusted using the same method to determine the cost/benefit adjustment, applying the same percentile amounts to the risk area to determine the amount of increase to the project schedule.

Risks that are evaluated as high impact and high probability and associated with cost drivers, such as the complexity of the integration effort, include a cost risk factored in each alternative estimate. The risk additions made for risks that impact cost drivers, generally a percentage of the estimated cost, are included in the specific cost item such as labor for an interface. The schedule reflects risk by including planning periods with each of the phases or modules. The phases or milestones are generally scheduled so that one segment is substantially complete before another begins. The EAS investment will undergo a baseline review prior to moving from phase to phase in its life cycle. Any risks identified during the course of business, as well as during the baseline review(s) are included in the Risk Management Ledger for proactive tracking.

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

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.

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

2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) No

- a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?
- b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:
- c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:

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

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

Exhibit 300: EPA Acquisition System (EAS) (Revision 10)

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
0	Initiation Stage Planning	7/11/2006	\$0.06	7/11/2006	7/11/2006	\$0.06	\$0.06	0	\$0.00	100%
1	Approve Project Plan and Update Security Plan	12/31/2006	\$0.02	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$0.02	\$0.02	0	\$0.00	100%
2	Select Support Contractor	3/31/2007	\$0.01	3/31/2007	3/31/2007	\$0.01	\$0.01	0	\$0.00	100%
3	Market Research	3/31/2007	\$0.06	3/31/2007	3/31/2007	\$0.06	\$0.06	0	\$0.00	100%
4	Formal Requirements Report	5/31/2007	\$0.14	5/31/2007	5/31/2007	\$0.14	\$0.14	0	\$0.00	100%
5	Request for Proposal (RFP) for EAS	7/31/2006	\$0.30	7/31/2006	7/31/2006	\$0.30	\$0.30	0	\$0.00	100%
6	Select EAS Vendor	9/28/2007	\$0.10	9/28/2007	9/28/2007	\$0.10	\$0.10	0	\$0.00	100%
7	Revise, Update Project Plans, Schedules, Reports	9/28/2007	\$0.97	9/28/2007	9/28/2007	\$0.97	\$0.97	0	\$0.00	100%
8	Project Management 1 – Gov FTE	9/28/2007	\$1.03	9/28/2007	9/28/2007	\$1.03	\$1.03	0	\$0.00	100%
9	Project Support 1	9/28/2007	\$0.34	9/28/2007	9/28/2007	\$0.34	\$0.34	0	\$0.00	100%
10	Project Management 2 – Gov FTE	9/30/2008	\$1.16	9/30/2008		\$1.16	\$0.87		\$0.00	75%
11	Project Support 2	9/30/2008	\$1.40	9/30/2008		\$1.40	\$1.05		\$0.00	75%
12	Business Process and Implementation Planning	12/31/2008	\$0.82			\$0.82	\$0.49		\$0.00	60%
13	Configuration Stage Management 1	9/30/2008	\$0.25	9/30/2008		\$0.25				0%
14	Integration/ Extension 1 – Core Capabilities	9/30/2008	\$0.85	9/30/2008		\$0.85				0%
15	Technical Infrastructure 1	9/30/2008	\$0.33	9/30/2008		\$0.33				0%
16	Functional Configuration & User Engagement 1	9/30/2008	\$0.55	9/30/2008		\$0.55				0%
17	Project Management 3 – Gov FTE	9/30/2009	\$1.49	9/30/2009		\$1.49				0%
18	Project Support 3	9/30/2009	\$1.40	9/30/2009		\$1.40				0%
19	Integration/ Extension 2 – Core	12/31/2008	\$0.15	12/31/2008		\$0.15				0%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	Capabilities									
20	Configuration Stage Management 2	12/31/2008	\$0.67	12/31/2008		\$0.67				0%
21	Technical Infrastructure 2	12/31/2008	\$0.22	12/31/2008		\$0.22				0%
22	Functional Configuration & User Engagement 2	12/31/2008	\$0.39	12/31/2008		\$0.39				0%
23	Testing Stage Management	3/31/2009	\$0.15	3/31/2009		\$0.15				0%
24	EAS Core Testing and Technical Readiness	3/31/2009	\$0.22	3/31/2009		\$0.22				0%
25	User Acceptance Testing & Engagement	3/31/2009	\$0.46	3/31/2009		\$0.46				0%
26	Integration/Extension 3 – O&M Release 1	9/30/2009	\$1.30	9/30/2009		\$1.30				0%
27	Deployment/Implementation Management	6/30/2009	\$0.15	6/30/2009		\$0.15				0%
28	Functional User Deployment	6/30/2009	\$0.51	6/30/2009		\$0.51				0%
29	Technical Deployment	6/30/2009	\$0.22	6/30/2009		\$0.22				0%
30	Implementation Complete & Deploy Support 1 (User & Tech)	9/30/2009	\$0.45	9/30/2009		\$0.45				0%
31	Project Management 4	9/30/2010	\$0.50	9/30/2010		\$0.50				0%
32	Project Support 4	9/30/2010	\$0.30	9/30/2010		\$0.30				0%
33	Implementation Complete & Deploy Support 2 (User & Tech)	12/31/2009	\$0.44	12/31/2009		\$0.44				0%
34	Integration/Extension 4 – O&M Release Testing	12/31/2009	\$0.23	12/31/2009		\$0.23				0%
35	O&M Management 1	9/30/2010	\$1.81	9/30/2010		\$1.81				0%
42	Data Migration 1	9/30/2008	\$0.11	9/30/2008		\$0.11				0%
43	Data Migration 2	3/31/2009	\$0.18	3/31/2009		\$0.18				0%
44	Data Migration 3	6/30/2009	\$0.12	6/30/2009		\$0.12				0%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
Project Totals										16.12%