

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: 4/10/2009
- 2. Agency: Environmental Protection Agency
- 3. Bureau: Office Of Solid Waste And Emergency Response
- 4. Name of this Capital Asset: BY2010 Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS)
- 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 020-00-01-13-01-3015-00
- 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.) Mixed Life Cycle
- 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2010

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:

SEMS is a new investment that will transform the Superfund program by improving operational effectiveness, reducing costs, streamlining business processes, and enhancing information management capabilities. SEMS will integrate OSWER's three primary Superfund data collection, reporting and tracking systems: CERCLIS, SDMS and ICTS, into a single system that will meet immediate and strategic Superfund needs. In the near term, system interfaces between existing Superfund systems will be established in order for SEMS development to occur while still allowing Superfund operations to continue. The long-term goal is for the three existing systems to retire with SEMS replacing them as the single official source of primary Superfund site activity data, records, and support documentation for SEMS internal and external stakeholders and customers to access and for the Agency to measure results against.

SEMS will also consolidate the Superfund program's disparate technical assets into a national management system with a single architecture on an Agency platform; adapt to shifting programmatic priorities and changing operational needs; and address the growing demands of content management, data exchange, and geospatial visualization. SEMS will serve as a model for how the Federal Government serves the public, the regulated community and partner agencies alike, and the consolidation will minimize risks to the Federal Government.

As SEMS progresses through its lifecycle, additional modules will be added that enable geolocational representation, permit retrieval of analytical data, and offer new customer user interfaces. SEMS will reduce redundancies by consolidating Superfund site level searches, sharing information among systems, and simplifying site searches - all within a single system. SEMS will also take advantage of enterprise architecture components as the EPA's EA and services oriented architectures mature, and serve as a nexus linking SEMS Program Office data to systems in other program offices and organizations, such as EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, Office of Environmental Information, and the Department of Justice.

SEMS will provide better service to citizens by establishing strong information management controls, cross-platform search functionalities, and efficient content delivery. SEMS will form a flexible and adaptive technological framework in support of Program decision making and lines of business.

- 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?

b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned?

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) (Revision 2)

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?

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?)

SEMS supports Expanded E-Gov by providing a source for Superfund information that will facilitate the sharing of organizational knowledge among stakeholders, customers, and States/Tribes. It will manage information associated with management of hazardous and non-hazardous wastes. Reference SDMS business case for SEMS' support of this initiative, as SDMS is a primary component of SEMS. Also, SEMS will be an input to the Agency's E-Gov system, the Enterprise Content Management System (ECMS).

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)

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? No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFIA compliance area?

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

2. If "no," what does it address?

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

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware 10
 Software 10
 Services 75
 Other 5

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? Yes

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 |
| Planning: | 0.3 | 0.8 | 1.343 | 0.61 |
| Acquisition: | 0 | 0.228 | 0.55 | 3.7 |
| Subtotal Planning & Acquisition: | 0.3 | 1.028 | 1.893 | 4.31 |
| Operations & Maintenance: | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| TOTAL: | 0.3 | 1.028 | 2.093 | 4.61 |
| Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above. | | | | |
| Government FTE Costs | 0.1 | 0.042 | 0.264 | 0.427 |
| Number of FTE represented by Costs: | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

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:

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: BY2010 Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) (Revision 2)

| 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) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 68-W-04-005 Task Order 71 | Cost Plus Incentive Fee | Yes | 8/15/2008 | 8/15/2008 | 8/14/2009 | | No | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes |
| DW-47-93935401 WCF Service PZ Order | Cost-Plus-Award-Fee, Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee and Firm Fixed Price | Yes | 9/1/2007 | 10/1/2007 | 9/1/2011 | | No | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes |
| EP-W-05-024 Task Order 36 | Cost plus Award Fee | Yes | 8/21/2006 | 8/21/2006 | 4/14/2010 | | No | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes |
| 68-W-04-005 | Cost Plus Incentive Fee | No | 8/15/2009 | 8/15/2009 | 9/30/2013 | | No | 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 ITS-ESE contract requires that the EPA Web Development Guide be adhered to for all web development tasks. The contractor utilizes tools that verify Section 508 compliance and the EPA Office of Public Affairs (OPA) verifies and approves of all public facing web sites and applications. Additionally, 508 compliance for the general system is part of the IT development Task Order itself. The EPA conducted 508 testing of SDMS. Findings were used to make numerous accessibility improvements to SDMS.

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

No

a. If "yes," what is the date?

1. Is it Current?

No

b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?

Yes

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

SEMS has an Acquisition Plan, but it does not currently fulfill the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1. The SEMS team is currently revising the Acquisition plan to bring it into compliance with the terms of FAR Subpart 7.1 with a targeted completion date of December 31, 2008.

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 |
| 2008 | Cross-Goal Strategies | Customer Results | Service Quality | Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered | Identified stakeholder groups participating in the requirements effort as reported in the SEMS Project Charter | 1% | 50% | Will be known on 10/1/2008 |
| 2008 | Cross-Goal Strategies | Mission and Business Results | Environmental Management | Environmental Remediation | Requirements traced to EPA Strategic Goals and FEA BRM | 0% | 80% | Will be known on 10/1/2008 |
| 2008 | Cross-Goal Strategies | Mission and Business Results | Environmental Management | Environmental Remediation | Number of descriptions of SEMS system releases with defined scope | 0 | 3 | Will be known on 10/1/2008 |
| 2008 | Cross-Goal Strategies | Processes and Activities | Management and Innovation | Participation | Number of SEMS supported business processes | 4 | 6 | Will be known on 10/1/2008 |
| 2008 | Cross-Goal Strategies | Technology | Information and Data | Data Reliability and Quality | Percentage of known redundancies between data | 0% | 25% | Will be known on 10/1/2008 |

| Performance Information Table | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|-----------------------------|
| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
| | | | | | fields in constituent systems (CERCLIS, SDMS and ICTS) | | | |
| 2008 | Cross-Goal Strategies | Technology | Information and Data | Data Standardization or Tagging | Percentage of SEMS data incorporated into EPA Superfund Information System /System of Registry. | 0% | 100% | Will be known on 10/01/2008 |
| 2009 | Cross-Goal Strategies | Customer Results | Service Quality | Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered | Percentage of identified stakeholder groups involved in requirements effort. | 50% | 80% | Will be known on 10/1/2009 |
| 2009 | Cross-Goal Strategies | Mission and Business Results | Environmental Management | Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting | Number of descriptions of SEMS system releases with defined scope. | 3 | 6 | Will be known on 10/1/2009 |
| 2009 | Cross-Goal Strategies | Processes and Activities | Management and Innovation | Participation | Number of SEMS supported business processes with documented system requirements. | 0 | 4 | Will be known on 10/1/2009 |
| 2009 | Cross-Goal Strategies | Technology | Information and Data | Data Standardization or Tagging | Percentage of known redundancies between data fields in constituent systems. (CERCLIS, SDMS, ICTS) | 25% | 100% | Will be known on 10/1/2009 |
| 2009 | Cross-Goal Strategies | Technology | Information and Data | Data Standardization or Tagging | Percentage of SEMS terminology and taxonomies incorporated into EPA System of Registry. | 0% | 50% | Will be known on 10/1/2009 |

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 Yes and integrated into the overall costs of the investment?:

a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 5

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

| 3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s): | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Name of System | Agency/ or Contractor Operated System? | Planned Operational Date | Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems) |
| Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) | Contractor and Government | 2/28/2009 | 11/30/2008 |

| 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 |
| Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) | Yes | Yes | This system does not collect PII on members of the public. Therefore, no PI is required to be posted. | 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 Yes

Strategy?

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

Superfund Enterprise Management System

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>. 325-000

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) |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| CERCLIS Import/Export Snapshot Processes | Defines the set of capabilities that support the interchange of information between multiple systems or applications. | Back Office Services | Data Management | Data Exchange | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| SDMS Metadata Management | Defines the set of capabilities that support the maintenance and administration of data that describes data. | Back Office Services | Data Management | Meta Data Management | | | No Reuse | 4 |
| ECMS Email Extender | SDMS captures metadata of Superfund related emails using ECMS email capture and ECMS Docbase | Back Office Services | Data Management | Meta Data Management | Meta Data Management | 020-00-01-16-04-0240-24 | Internal | 0 |
| Application Integration | Application integration of all the Superfund systems, such as SDMS, ICTS, CERCLIS | Back Office Services | Development and Integration | Enterprise Application Integration | | | No Reuse | 10 |
| SEMS Business Intelligence | Defines the set of capabilities that support business analytics | Business Analytical Services | Business Intelligence | Decision Support and Planning | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| SEMS Business Intelligence | Defines the set of capabilities that support business analytics | Business Analytical Services | Reporting | Ad Hoc | | | No Reuse | 1 |
| SEMS Business Intelligence | Defines the set of capabilities that support business analytics | Business Analytical Services | Reporting | Standardized / Canned | | | No Reuse | 1 |
| CERCLIS Change Management | Control the process for updates or modifications to the existing documents, software, or business processes of an organization | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Change Management | | | No Reuse | 6 |
| CERCLIS Configuration Management | Control the hardware and software environment, as well as documents of an | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Configuration Management | | | No Reuse | 6 |

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) (Revision 2)

| 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) |
| | organization | | | | | | | |
| Configuration Management | Process and tools for software version and release management | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Configuration Management | Configuration Management | 020-00-01-16-04-0240-24 | Internal | 1 |
| CERCLIS Project Management | Manage and control a particular effort of an organization | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Program / Project Management | | | No Reuse | 5 |
| SDMS Life Cycle Management | SDMS Life Cycle Management | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Quality Management | | | No Reuse | 2 |
| CERCLIS Requirements Management | Gather, analyze, and fulfill the needs and prerequisites of an organization's efforts | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Requirements Management | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| SDMS Portal | Integration with EPA Portal | Digital Asset Services | Content Management | Content Publishing and Delivery | Content Publishing and Delivery | 020-00-01-16-02-6029-00 | Internal | 2 |
| Workflow Services | Documentum Workflow Manager, ExpressLink, Business Process Manager | Digital Asset Services | Content Management | Content Review and Approval | Content Review and Approval | 020-00-01-16-04-0240-24 | Internal | 0 |
| SDMS Content Capture | Defines the subset of capability for conversion of document formats | Digital Asset Services | Document Management | Document Conversion | | | No Reuse | 1 |
| Scanning Services | Kofax Ascent Capture | Digital Asset Services | Document Management | Document Imaging and OCR | | | No Reuse | 2 |
| Document Management Services | Cross referencing of documents using Documentum | Digital Asset Services | Document Management | Document Referencing | Document Referencing | 020-00-01-16-04-0240-24 | Internal | 2 |
| SDMS Content Capture | Defines the set of capabilities that facilitate collection of data. | Digital Asset Services | Document Management | Indexing | | | No Reuse | 2 |
| SDMS Search and Retrieval | Defines the set of capabilities that support indexing for search and retrieval | Digital Asset Services | Document Management | Indexing | | | No Reuse | 2 |
| ECMS Repository Management | Defines the set of capabilities that support document and data warehousing and archiving. | Digital Asset Services | Document Management | Library / Storage | Library / Storage | 020-00-01-16-04-0240-24 | Internal | 4 |
| Document Management Services | Documentum virtual document, SDMS Collections, SDMS Central Registry | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Information Mapping / Taxonomy | Information Mapping / Taxonomy | 020-00-01-16-04-0240-24 | Internal | 2 |
| CERCLIS C-Pad Extract | Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of documents and data in a multi-user environment for use by an organization and its stakeholders. | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Information Retrieval | | | No Reuse | 2 |
| SDMS Search | Defines the set | Digital Asset | Knowledge | Information | | | No Reuse | 4 |

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) (Revision 2)

| 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) |
| and Retrieval | of capabilities that support selection and retrieval of records organized by shared characteristics in content or context. | Services | Management | Retrieval | | | | |
| CERCLIS C-Pad Web Extract | Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of documents and data in a multi-user environment for use by an organization and its stakeholders. | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Information Sharing | | | No Reuse | 4 |
| SDMS Content Sharing | Defines the capabilities to share SDMS data across the ECMS, ICTS, CERCLIS Platforms and CD-ROM media. | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Information Sharing | Information Sharing | 020-00-01-16-01-6029-00 | Internal | 4 |
| Workflow Services | Documentum Workflow Manager, ExpressLink, Business Process Manager | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Knowledge Capture | Knowledge Capture | 020-00-01-16-04-0240-24 | Internal | 1 |
| SDMS Portal | Provide access to the SDMS documents | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | 020-00-01-16-01-6006-00 | Internal | 0 |
| ECMS Records Management | Defines the set of capabilities that allow classification of data and information into specific layers or types to support an organization. | Digital Asset Services | Records Management | Document Classification | Document Classification | 020-00-01-16-04-0240-24 | Internal | 2 |
| Records Management Services | Records Manager, SDMS (standard) File Plan, Agency-wide File Plan, Records Manager/Retention Policy Services | Digital Asset Services | Records Management | Record Linking / Association | Record Linking / Association | 020-00-01-16-04-0240-24 | Internal | 2 |
| Portal Collaboration | Workspaces, Content Services, Discussion Services, Calendar Services | Support Services | Collaboration | Threaded Discussions | Threaded Discussions | 020-00-01-16-01-6006-00 | Internal | 1 |
| CERCLIS System Administration | Support the management of permissions for logging onto a computer, application, service, or network: includes user management and role/privilege management. | Support Services | Security Management | Access Control | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| CERCLIS Access Audit | Support the identification and monitoring of activities within an application, | Support Services | Security Management | Audit Trail Capture and Analysis | | | No Reuse | 2 |

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) (Revision 2)

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) |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | system, or network. | | | | | | | |
| CERCLIS User Identification Authentication | Support obtaining information about those parties attempting to log on to a system or application for security purposes and the validation of those users. | Support Services | Security Management | Identification and Authentication | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| SDMS Identity and Access Management | Provide Authorization, Authentication and ID Provisioning Services to SDMS. | Support Services | Security Management | Identification and Authentication | Identification and Authentication | 020-00-01-16-02-6006-00 | Internal | 2 |
| CERCLIS Intrusion Detection | Includes penetration detection testing and other measures to detect unauthorized access to a government information system. | Support Services | Security Management | Intrusion Detection | | | No Reuse | 2 |
| CERCLIS Project Management | Manage and control a particular effort of an organization. | Support Services | Systems Management | Issue Tracking | | | No Reuse | 3 |

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) |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Document Referencing | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Dependent Technologies | |
| Knowledge Capture | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Dependent Technologies | |
| Meta Data Management | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Dependent Technologies | |
| Content Review and Approval | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | |
| Standardized / Canned | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | |
| Information Sharing | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | |
| Data Exchange | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | |
| Library / Storage | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | |
| Library / Storage | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | |

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) (Revision 2)

| 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) |
| Information Retrieval | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | |
| Configuration Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | |
| Information Retrieval | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | |
| Decision Support and Planning | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | |
| Ad Hoc | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | |
| Standardized / Canned | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | |
| Standardized / Canned | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | |
| Information Sharing | Component Framework | Security | Certificates / Digital Signatures | |
| Intrusion Detection | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | |
| Identification and Authentication | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | |
| Identification and Authentication | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | |
| Audit Trail Capture and Analysis | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | |
| Access Control | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | |
| Access Control | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | |
| Identification and Authentication | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Component Framework | User Presentation / Interface | Content Rendering | |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Component Framework | User Presentation / Interface | Content Rendering | |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Component Framework | User Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Component Framework | User Presentation / Interface | Static Display | |
| Threaded Discussions | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | |
| Information Sharing | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Other Electronic Channels | |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Internet | |
| Configuration Management | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Intranet | |
| Configuration Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Requirements | Hosting | |
| Library / Storage | Service Access and Delivery | Service Requirements | Legislative / Compliance | |
| Requirements Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Requirements | Legislative / Compliance | |
| Library / Storage | Service Access and Delivery | Service Requirements | Legislative / Compliance | |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Service Transport | |
| Configuration Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Service Transport | |
| Enterprise Application Integration | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Enterprise Application Integration | |
| Information Sharing | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | |
| Information Sharing | Service Interface and Integration | Interface | Service Description / Interface | |
| Document Classification | Service Interface and Integration | Interoperability | Data Format / Classification | |
| Document Classification | Service Interface and Integration | Interoperability | Data Format / Classification | |
| Document Conversion | Service Interface and Integration | Interoperability | Data Transformation | |
| Record Linking / Association | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | |
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | |
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Storage | |
| Library / Storage | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Storage | |

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) (Revision 2)

| 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) |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Application Servers | |
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Application Servers | |
| Content Publishing and Delivery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Portal Servers | |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Web Servers | |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Local Area Network (LAN) | |
| Library / Storage | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Network Devices / Standards | |
| Document Imaging and OCR | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Peripherals | |
| Information Retrieval | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Peripherals | |
| Library / Storage | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | |
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Wide Area Network (WAN) | |
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | |
| Change Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | |
| Issue Tracking | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | |
| Change Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | |
| Change Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | |
| Change Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | |
| Requirements Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | |
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | |
| Access Control | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Test Management | |
| Change Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Test Management | |
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Test Management | |
| Quality Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Test Management | |
| Access Control | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Test Management | |
| Change Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Test Management | |
| Information Mapping / Taxonomy | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Dependent Platform | |
| Library / Storage | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Dependent Platform | |
| Indexing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Dependent Platform | |
| Document Imaging and OCR | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Dependent Platform | |
| Information Sharing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Dependent Platform | |
| Program / Project Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Dependent Platform | |
| Program / Project Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Dependent Platform | |
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Dependent Platform | |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Independent Platform | |

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: BY2010 Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) (Revision 2)

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)? No

a. If "yes," please describe.

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? 6/9/2006
 - 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: * Costs in millions | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table: | | | |
| Alternative Analyzed | Description of Alternative | Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate | Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate |
| Alternative 1: Integrate the Functions of the Current Systems into One System | Integrate the functions of the three existing core Superfund management systems, CERCLIS, SDMS and ICTS, into one system that capitalizes on the successful areas of each system, leveraging the capabilities and strengths of the existing systems while eliminating the redundant design features, data collection efforts and maintenance activities. The result would be a one stop source for Superfund data collection and tracking activities creating a Superfund Enterprise Management System. | 33.12 | 60.391 |
| Alternative 2: Link current systems (no integration) | Maintain the current systems developing software linkages between them. This alternative does not integrate functions or modify the design of Superfund tracking, but continues the separate management of data sources, while developing centralized management dashboards to offer the appearance of a single source for information. This alternative's benefits were estimated as zero as it does not upgrade CERCLIS, which is currently obsolete and not in compliance with EPA and Federal guidelines. | 43.4 | 0 |
| Alternative 3: Create a new system | Creating a new system would allow OSRTI to review its business needs from a holistic perspective and to build a customized system with tailored processes leveraging the latest capabilities of the information technology industry. By starting with a blank slate, OSRTI would not be hampered by the limitations of existing system capabilities, business rules, or data models. A comprehensive requirements analysis could take place and optimal solutions with streamlined processes could result. | 75.4 | 61 |
| Status Quo | Maintain current state of the three existing core SMS. This alternative's benefits were estimated as zero as it does not upgrade CERCLIS, which is currently obsolete and not in compliance with EPA and Federal guidelines. | 39 | 0 |

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?

The Agency chose Alternative 1: "The integration of the three existing core Superfund Management Systems (e.g., SDMS, CERCLIS and ICTS) into a single Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS)", as the most viable Alternative, and the one that would best close the performance gap for capturing, preserving and disseminating legislatively mandated Superfund documents and records.

The SDMS, CERCLIS, and ICTS legacy system business cases are addressed in two separate Exhibit 300s and in a CPIC Lite,

respectively. The projected disposition dates of these systems are listed in the table in question 5b.

The proposed SEMS is consistent with EPA EA strategies of reusing existing components and capabilities. It reduces redundancies by having a single project management team responsible for one large investment and having a single Certified and Accredited system instead of multiple systems. It is the least cost alternative and the Return on Investment (ROI) yields the same benefits as customizing a new system with much reduced risk and a shorter implementation time. The SEMS alternative leverages proven in-use applications. The other alternatives were not chosen because they were inferior to SEMS in terms of cost, performance, or both. Alternative 2 and the Status quo have similar costs as the SEMS alternative, but since neither would provide updates to CERCLIS (currently obsolete and not in compliance with EPA and Federal Guidelines) they were not chosen. Alternative 3 provides the same benefits to Alternative 1 at a much higher cost and risk to the Federal Government. Alternative 1 is less expensive, less risky, and provides more benefits than all other Alternatives, which is why it was chosen.

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?

The SEMS alternative is the lowest risk alternative as there is sufficient and proven internal knowledge, documentation and training available to modify and integrate the existing systems. SEMS is compliant with the EA Target Architecture. It addresses the Superfund's IT requirements and allows for future growth. It is responsive to users needs as it delivers standard as well as ad hoc reporting capabilities. SEMS is a one-stop solution with a single sign-on with one solution to access the information formerly in three disparate systems. The integration of information reduces data entry error potential and therefore provides more accurate, consistent and reliable information. SEMS is web based and therefore provides greater access and usability.

Only Alternatives 1 and 3 include an update of CERCLIS to a Java-based system, which is necessary for CERCLIS to become compliant with EPA and Federal guidelines. Currently, CERCLIS is running on an obsolete platform, and it is not in compliance with EPA and Federal standards for data collection systems. Alternative 1 is less risky and has a higher net present value than alternative 3, and for these reasons it was selected as the most viable alternative.

| 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 | | The SEMS project is still in planning and the project scope is still being defined as new requirements are identified. As such, the cost avoidance numbers will be updated to reflect the current status of the SEMS project and will be reflected in the revised CBA to be completed in FY 2009. These benefits will be realized with the first Release targeted for the 1st Quarter of FY 2011. |
| CY 2009 | 0 | 0 | | The SEMS project is still in planning and the project scope is still being defined as new requirements are identified. As such, the cost avoidance numbers will be updated to reflect the current status of the SEMS project and will be reflected in the revised CBA to be completed in FY 2009. These benefits will be realized with the first Release targeted for the 1st Quarter of FY 2011. |
| BY 2010 | 0 | 0 | | The SEMS project is in development, and the project scope is being defined as new requirements are identified. As such, the cost avoidance numbers will be updated to reflect the current status of the SEMS project and will be reflected in the revised CBA to be completed in FY 2009. These benefits will be realized with the first Release targeted for the 1st Quarter of FY 2011. |

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

a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration

investment?

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 |
| ICTS | 020-00-01-13-02-3005-00 | 9/30/2008 |

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? 5/30/2008
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? No
- c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

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

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

SEMS's Risk Management plan gathers input from project stakeholders and team members to identify, analyze, and correct for risks to the project's cost and schedule.

The cost and schedule impacts of risks are weighted by their potential impact and probability of occurrence, and applied to the project's budget planning through the use of reserves. Reserves are used to contain project risk; Contingency Reserves are separately planned quantities used to accommodate future risks that may be planned for only in part (these are known "unknowns"); Management Reserves are separately planned quantities used to allow for future risks that are impossible to predict (these are unknown "unknowns"). Reserves can be based on time (schedule reserve) and money (budget reserves). At least one of the three project constraints (cost, schedule, and scope) must be adjustable. The project's Risk Management plan ensures that that reserves are added to best estimates (not subtracted), and reserves of 5-50% should be set aside for all other risks.

Identified schedule risks are mapped to the specific element of the project's Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) where their probability of occurrence and potential impact is weighted and factored into the project's schedule.

When the SEMS Alternatives Analysis is updated in FY2009, the cost factors associated with the newly identified risks will be factored into the costs and benefits of the various alternatives, further limiting the potential damage from costs associated with risks.

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?

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 | | | |
| 1a | Pre-release Setup (PMO); e.g., Define Solution Architecture, Define first level data model | 12/31/2009 | \$0.490000 | 12/31/2009 | | \$0.490000 | \$0.382000 | | \$0.000200 | 78% |
| 1b | Pre-release Setup (Developer) | 12/31/2009 | \$1.700000 | 12/31/2009 | | \$1.700000 | \$0.680000 | | \$0.000000 | 40% |
| 9b | Operations and Maintenance – RTP | 9/30/2010 | \$0.300000 | 9/30/2010 | | \$0.300000 | | | | 0% |