BY08 Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary
Exhibit 300

PART I: SUMMARY INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION

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

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

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

(1) Date of Submission:	09/11/2006
(2) Agency:	422
(3) Bureau:	00
(4) Name of this Capital Asset: (250 Character Max)	Proposals, Reviews and Awards Management Integration System (PRAMIS)
(5) Unique ID (Unique Project Identifier):	422-00-04-00-01-0008-00
Format xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx (For IT investments only, see section *53.* For all other, use agency ID system.)	
(6) What kind of investment will this be in FY2008?	Mixed Life Cycle
(7) What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2003

(8) Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes a gap in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap: (2500 Char Max)

PRAMIS is a system of systems that provides comprehensive services to manage the grants life cycle and supporting business processes of NSF, providing functional and technology upgrades that position NSF to take advantage of Federal-wide initiatives such as Grants.gov and the Grants Management Line of Business as well as provide effective solutions to current NSF grants management needs. There are three types of PRAMIS services: (1) Core Enterprise Services such as identity management, business intelligence, and workflow, which provide a common set of technical capabilities that are shared across the enterprise, (2) E-Gov and Grants Management services, which provide Grants Life Cycle Management capabilities to NSF and other Federal grant-making agencies, in a manner that takes appropriate advantage of areas of specialization across the Grants lifecycle. Included in this category is NSF's state of the art integration with Grants.gov that allows NSF to capture the proposal data submitted via Grants.gov so that proposals can be processed electronically by the PRAMIS eJacket system, (3) Administrative Enterprise Services are those business

services needed to manage all other business and administrative functions, whether offered by a line of business agency partner, or NSF-provided, These next generation information technology capabilities go far beyond automation of paper-based business processes, Instead, they provide lower cost of operations for both NSF and other agency partners, greater flexibility, increased capabilities, and faster deployments, Problems addressed by PRAMIS include: (1) Technology obsolescence – outdated technology platforms cannot meet user demands, drive up maintenance costs; (2) Stove-piped applications – delivering shared services and enhancements across legacy applications is overly difficult, puts undue burden on users, causes high operational costs, (3) Inflexible architecture - cannot accommodate effective business process improvements, measure against new performance goals, mine transaction data for problems and opportunities; (4) Cannot meet enterprise architecture goals – NSF needs to create eGovernment services that are flexible, meet public needs well, and can be shared across organizational boundaries, which will be enabled by this investment,

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

11) Contact Information of Project Manager?

Name:	Maureen Miller
Phone Number:	(703) 292-4273
E-Mail:	mmiller@nsf.gov

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

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

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

"yes," select all that apply:

President's Management Agenda (PMA) Initiatives

Expanded E-Government

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

PRAMIS fully supports the Expanded Electronic Government goal of the PMA: (1) PRAMIS implemented both NSF's integration with Grants.gov, as well as (2) the Grants Management Line of Business (GMLoB) pilot application as a trial for NSF's role as consortium lead. In addition, PRAMIS implemented E-Authentication for (3) the FastLane system, as well as for the (4) GMLoB pilot task, as part of the vision for a interagency grants service.

(14) Does this investment support a program assessed using OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (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? (see section 53 for definition)) yes

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

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

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

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

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

n/a

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

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

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

Section B: Summary of Funding (All Capital Assets)

(1) Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included 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 SUMMARY OF SPENDINGYOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)
MI amounts represent Budget Authority (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY - 1 Spending Prior to 2006	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY+1 2009	BY+2 2010	BY+3 2011	BY+4 2012 and beyond	Total
Acquisition	$9.900	$4.500							
Planning	$1,400	$0.600							
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition	$11,300	$5.10	$4.10	$5,560					
Operations Maintenance	$6.100	$2.700	$4,100	$2.500					
OTAL	$17,40	$7.800	$8,200	$8.060					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in he amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	$2.500	$1.200	$1.300	$1.100					
Number of FTE represented by cost	18								

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

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

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

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

Due to budget constraints, spending for PRAMIS was less than approved, NSF mitigated the effects of this by addressing only the highest priority requirements based on external commitments, regulatory mandate, strategic value, and customer return on investment,

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

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

Contract or Task Order Number: BZ-11/0533982 Type of Contract/TO Used: Cost Plus Fixed Fee
Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes
Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:
05/01/2005
Contract/TO Start Date:
05/01/2005
Contract/TO End Date:
04/30/2007
Contract/TO Total Value ($M): $32,200 Inter Agency Acquisition: no
Performance Based Contract: no
Competitively Awarded Contract: yes
Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes
Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

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

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

Earned value is required for this contract,

(3) Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? yes

Section 508 Compliance Explanation:
Section 508 compliance is a checkpoint in NSF's software deployment process, 508 compliance is a contractual requirement for purchased business software, and every new application or module is tested for 508 compliance as well as true accessibility prior to deployment,

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

(a) If "yes", what is the date? 12/01/2001

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

[1] If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

Agencies must use Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

Table 1

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/ Baseline (from previous year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2002	Grants Administration and E-Government	Improved Efficiency in Proposal Processing	Highly-Rated Electronic Government	Meet or Exceed PMA Requirements in Electronic Government	NSF Received the only Green Light for E-Government
2004	Grants Administration	Improve ease of use and staff effectiveness in proposal processing for declined proposals,	Internal processing performed through multiple systems,	Integrate Proposal Decline Processing through Implementation of an eJacket	Successful implementation of eJacket Pathfinder (Phases 1, 2, and 3)
2004	Grants Administration	Electronic Processing and Records for Non-Award Actions	Paper-based process for 70% of NSF Proposals	Electronic Processing and Archiving of NSF's non-permanent records.	Over 99% of proposals received electronically,
2005	eGovernment Initiatives	Migrate/Implement eGov Solution Sets	Paper-based processes for eTravel, eProcurement/Property, and eRecords.	Adoption/Implementation of eGov Solution Sets	eTravel system implemented.
2005	eGovernment Initiatives	Migrate/Implement eGov Solution Sets	Federal Grant-making agencies offer no common mechanism for applicants to FIND and APPLY for Federal Grants,	Post 25% of all discretionary grant application packages on Grants.gov, including all discretionary grants programs using only the SF-124 family of forms.	Grants.gov integration completed and in use for find and apply functions.
2005	Grants Administration	Consolidate stove-piped grants administration applications, implementing the target NSF architecture,	Many stove-piped, technologically outdated applications needed to administer the grants process,	Consolidate multiple legacy grants admin applications into eJacket Pathfinder,	eCorrespondence functionality moved to eJacket. Budget review function moved to eJacket,

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/ Baseline (from previous year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2005	Grants Administration	Automate one of the last remaining paper-driven processes at NSF using the NSF target enterprise architecture technologies,	Processes for handling travel for thousands of merit review panelists is cumbersome, error-prone, and paper-driven,	Begin handling panelist travel via end-to-end automated guest travel capabilities,	Initial use of end-to-end automated guest travel capabilities for merit review panels.
2005	Identity and Access Management	Convert NSF applications to federated identity management,	All NSF require duplicate log in for every use with internally-managed credentials.	Users able to log in to FastLane with credentials from at least two credential service providers,	Users able to log in to FastLane with credentials from ORC (Grants.gov) and USDA.
2006	e-Government Initiatives	Migrate/Implement e-Gov Solution Sets	Federal Grants-making agencies offer no common mechanism applicants to find and apply for Federal grants.	Post 75% of discretionary grant applications packages on Grants.gov, including all discretionary grant programs using only theSF-424 family of forms	NSF met the goal by posting 80% of discretionary grant application packages on Grants.gov,
2007	Grants administration	Consolidate stove-piped grants administration applications, implementing the target NSF architecture.	NSF grants management spread over disparate, stove-piped, and outdated systems, causing high maintenance cost and difficulty in offering flexible, high-value grants services,	Consolidate multiple legacy grants admin applications into eJacket Pathfinder.	
2007	Identity and Access Management	Implement a corporate directory encompassing person, role, and organization data using leading technologies,	NSF internal identity management spread over disparate, stove-piped, and outdated systems, causing high maintenance cost and inability to offer high-value identity services.	Corporate directory implemented for authentication and authorization.	
2007	Identity and Access Management	Convert NSF applications to federated identity management,	All NSF require duplicate log in for every use with internally-managed credentials.	GMLoB Pilot or successor E-Authentication-enabled,	
2007	e-Government Initiatives	Migrate/Implement e-Gov Solution Sets	Federal Grants-making agencies offer no common mechanism applicants to find and apply for Federal grants,	Post all discretionary grant applications packages on Grants.gov (100% complete)	
2007	Strategic Information Management	Deliver requirements for a cross-enterprise, high-value data repository.	NSF has disparate, limited data repositories, and very limited and outdated tools for accessing that information,	Accepted requirements document for strategic information management of grants data.	
2008	Strategic Information Management	Develop a cross-enterprise, high-value data repository, and move existing data to it. Provide effective tools for users to access and gain knowledge from that data,	NSF has disparate, limited data repositories, and very limited and outdated tools for accessing that information,	Pilot at least one common, enterprise data repository, and deliver an effective toolset to access that data,	
2008	Grants administration & oversight	Consolidate stove-piped grants administration applications, implementing the target NSF architecture,	NSF grants management spread over disparate, stove-piped, and outdated systems, causing high Maintenance cost and difficulty in offering flexible, high-value grants services,	Deliver requirements for consolidating grant awards functionality into EJacket Pathfinder,	
2008	e-Government Initiatives	Convert NSF applications to federated identity management,	All NSF require duplicate log in for every use with internally-managed credentials.	FY08 Target application E-Authentication-enabled, as agreed to with E-Auth PMO,	

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/ Baseline (from previous year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2008	Identity & access management	Implement enterprise single sign-on solution.	All NSF require duplicate log in for every use with internally-managed credentials.	A single sign-on solution is delivered, and at least two applications have migrated to it.	

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

Table 2

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

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

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

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

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

(1) Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment: yes

(a) If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 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 - Security:

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

(4) Operational Systems - Security:

Name Of System	Agency Or Contractor Operated system	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact Level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has the C&A been completed using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards we used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Completed Security Control Testing	Date Contingency Plan Tested
eJacket	Contractor and Government	Moderate	yes	07/29/03	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	06/20/06	02/16/06

(5) Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? no

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

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

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

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

NSF uses a range of methods to review the security of operations through contract requirements, project management oversight and review, certification and accreditation processes, IG independent reviews, proactive testing of controls through penetration testing and vulnerability scans to ensure services are adequately secure and meet the requirements of FISMA, OMB policy, NIST guidelines and NSF policy. The system is operated on-site by a team of contractors and NSF personnel with system administrators tightly controlling access to the systems. Only administrators with current need have access to the system, and strict code migration, quality control, and configuration management procedures prevent deployment of hostile or vulnerable software on the systems. Contractors are trained in the same security measures as NSF employees. All NSF employees and contract staff are required to complete an on-line security training class each year, including the rules of behavior. Background checks are done routinely as a part of the NSF contracting process, and IT security requirements are stated in the contract's statement of work. Contractor security procedures are monitored, verified, and validated by the agency in the same way as for government employees. Once on board, contractors are allowed access to the NSF systems based on their specific job requirements. Audit logs are also implemented to monitor operating system changes - these audit logs are reviewed regularly by the system administrators. Additionally, roles and responsibilities are separated to the extent possible to allow for checks and balances in system management and multiple levels of oversight.

(8) Planning and Operational Systems - Privacy:

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

(c) Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.
4. No, because even though it has personal identifying information, the system contains information solely about federal employees and agency contractors.

(d) Is the PIA available to the public?

1. Yes.
2. No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.
3. No, because the PIA has not been prepared.

(f) Was a new or amended SORN published in FY2006?

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

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

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

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

(2) Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? yes

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.	This investment is the primary vehicle for implementing NSF's EA Transition: via eJacket, Authentication, Authorization, Enterprise Reporting, Workflow, Rules Engine, BI Engine, Data Warehouse, Business Services,' etc.

b. If "no," please explain why?	

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEASRM Service Type	FEA **SRM** Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal External Reuse (c)	Funding Percentage (d)
				Reused Service	Reused Service Component UPI		
eJacket	Enterprise Reporting	Data Management	Data Warehouse			No Reuse	
eJacket	Enterprise Reporting	Data Management	Meta Data Management			No Reuse	
eJacket	Enterprise Reporting	Data Management	Extraction and Transformation			No Reuse	
eJacket	Enterprise Reporting	Data Management	Loading and Archiving			No Reuse	
eJacket	Enterprise Reporting	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	
eJacket	Grants.gov Integration	Development and Integration	Data Integration			No Reuse	15
eJacket		Development and Integration	Legacy Integration			No Reuse	
eJacket	Rules Engine	Management of Processes	Business Rule Management			No Reuse	10
AAMS	eProcurement System	Supply Chain Management	Procurement			No Reuse ' "	5
eJacket	eCorrespondence	Customer Preferences	Alerts and Notifications			No Reuse	6
eJacket		Content Management	Content Review and Approval			No Reuse	6
eJacket		Records Management	Document Retirement			No Reuse	3
eJacket	eCorrespondence	Routing and Scheduling	Inbound Correspondence Management			No Reuse	
eJacket		Tracking and Workflow	Case Management			No Reuse	30
eJacket	Workflow	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	5

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

b. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this

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

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

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

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

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	FEAService Specification (b)
Alerts and Notifications	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Assistance Request	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Assistance Request	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Business Rule Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Case Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	Internal (within agency)
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Section 508
Case Management	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Secure Sockets Layer (SSL)
Content Authoring	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Content Authoring	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Content Authoring	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	Java Server Pages (JSP)
Content Review and Approval	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Customer Analytics	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Customer Feedback	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Customer Feedbacks	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	

Customer Feedback	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Data Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Demand Forecasting / Mgmt	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Document Classification	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Document Retirement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Event / News Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Extraction and Transformation	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Legacy Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration,	Middleware	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Loading and Archiving	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Loading and Archiving	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability,	Data Transformation	
Meta Data Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Java Database Connectivity (JDBC)
Multi-Lingual Support	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Online Help	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Online Help	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Personalization	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)

Reservations / Registration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Reservations / Registration	Service Access and Delivery.	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Sales and Marketing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Self-Service	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Standardized I Canned	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Subscriptions	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers.	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Subscriptions	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Version Management, Defect Tracking, Issue Management Change Management, Requirements Management and Traceability
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	Version Management, Defect Tracking, Issue Management, Change Management, Requirements Management and Traceability
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Functional Testing, Usability Testing (508 Testing), Performance Profiling, Load/StressNolume Testing, Security and Access Control Testing

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

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

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

In 2008 eJacket will implement E-Authentication federated identity management.

6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system? no

(a) If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?	Select...
[1] If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).	

PART II: PLANNING, ACQUISITION AND PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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.

Section A: **Alternatives Analysis** (All **Capital Assets)**

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?

07/01/2004

b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

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

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Lifecycle Costs Estimates	Lifecycle Benefits Estimate
Alt 3 for Grants.gov Integration: system-to-system with database	A web service capability would transfer proposals from Grants.gov. XML content would be mapped to and loaded in the proposal database. PDF attachments would be associated these with an application using an existing method at NSF.		

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

Grants.gov Integration: The overall value of alternative 3, the system-to-system with database approach, was considered higher. The lifecycle costs would ultimately be lower, and the qualitative aspects, such as speed and flexibility for the future were better. NSF has experience and expertise in managing development projects of this nature, so the project risk was considered low. Participation in this program was mandatory, so the return on investment was simply the accomplishment of a required task in the manner with the best value to NSF.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Grants.gov Integration: Leverages existing investments in proposal management tools for a smooth and consistent user experience. Continued fast processing of proposals 100% automated processing. Reduced errors and rework for proposal validation.

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?

09/01/2005

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

no

c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?

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

b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing risks?

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

Major work changes or extensions trigger an investment baseline review. These reviews ensure that cost and schedule estimates are risk-weighted, and that the project risk management plan is updated before proceeding. Detailed risks are tracked until resolved.

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. Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. Indicate whether the information provided is contractor-only, or whether it includes both government and contractor costs.

   a. What is the Planned Value (PV)? $2,557,890.000
   b. What is the Earned Value (EV)? $2,380,722.000
   c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)? $2,365,338.000
   d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both) Contractor Only
   e. "As of" Date:

07/31/2006

3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI= EV/PV)? 0.93

4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)? -$177,168

5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)? 1.010

6. What is the cost variance (CV = EV–AC)? $15,384.000

7. Is the CV or SV greater than plus or minus (+ -) 10%? no

   a. If "yes," was it the CV, SV, or Both?
   b. If "yes," explain the variance:
   c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?
   d. What is the most current "Estimate at Completion"? $2,885,851.000

8. Have significant changes been made to the baseline during

the past fiscal year? no 8.a. If "yes" when was it approved by OMB?

9. 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 Milestone" and "Percent Complete" fields are required. Indicate "0" for any milestone no longer active.

	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Schedule Variance (# days)	Current Baseline Cost Variance ($M)	Actual Percent Complete
Description of Milestone	Planned Completion Date	Total Costs ($M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned	Completion Date Actual	Total Costs ($M) Planned	Total Costs ($M) Actual			
Grants Administration and Oversight - eJacket Pathfinder (New Development)	10/23/04	$2.583	10/23/04	10/23/04	$2.583	$1.868		-$0.720	:100
Guest Travel and Reimbursement System - Phase 1	9/4/04	$0.605	9/4/04	9/4/04	$0.605	$1.045		$0.440	100:
Grants Administration and Oversight - eJacket Pathfinder (Maintenance)	9/30/04	$1.262	9/30/04	9/30/04	$1.262	$0.502		-$0.760	100
e-Travel Business Case	9/1/05	$0.200	9/1/04	9/30/04	$0.200	$0.200	29	$0.000	100
eGov Initiatives - Grants.gov Integration Phase 1	10/29/04	80.858	10/29/04	10/29/04	$0.858	$0.426		-$0.430	100
PRAMIS Program Management - Common Solutions	9/30/06	$1.753	9/30/06	9/30/06	$0.600	$0.560		-$0.040	100
Grants Adminstration and Oversight - Phase 2	10/31/05	$2,267	10/31/05	10/31/05	.$2,267	$1.169		$1.098	100
Strategic Information Assets Management - Phase 1	10/31/05	$0.657	10/31/05	10/31/05	$0.657	$0.455		$0.202	100
eGov Initiatives - Grants.gov Integration Phase 2	9/30/05	$2,215	9/30/05	9/30/05	$2,215	$1.249		$0.966	100
eGov Initiatives - Pilots for Grants Management Line of Business	10/1/05	$0.027	8/5/06	8/12/06	$0.300	$0.390		$0.090	100
Indentity Management- eAuthentication Pilot	7/1/04	$0.187	7/1/04	9/30/04	$0.187	$0.190	15	-$0.120	100

Identity Management - FastLane eAuthentication Production	9/30/05	$0.600	9/30/05	10/15/05	$0.600	$0.480	15:	$0.120	100
Identity Management- Corporate Directory Phase 1	10/31/05	$1.136	4/30/06	5/5/06	$0.350	$0.383		$0.030	100
Infrastructure Upgrades	9/30/04	$1.468	9/30/04	9/30/04	$1 A68	$1.238		-$0.230	100
PIMS Upgrade - Phase 1	9/30/04	$0.184	9/30/04	9/30/04	$0.184	$0.211		$0.030	100
Guest Travel and Reimbursement System - Phase 2	9/30/05	$0.466	9/30/05	5/31/05	$0.466	$0.477	-122	$0.010	100
Facilities Tracking - Phase 1	9/30/05	$0.361,	9/30/05	9/30/05	$0.361	$0.329		$0.032	100
PIMS Upgrade - Phase 2	1/31/06	$0.853	1/31/06	1/31/06	$0.853	$0.071:		$0.782	100
Purchasing and Property - Requirements Phase	9/30/04	$0.100	9/30/04	9/30/04	$0.100	$0.100		$0.000	100
Purchasing and Property - Alt. Analysis Phase	9/30/05	$0.200	9/30/05	9/30/05	$0.200.	$0.048		-$0.150	100
Project Reports - Requirements Phase	9/30/05	$0.034	9/30/05	10/30/05	$0.069	$0.070	30	$0.001	100
Maintenance FY2005	9/30/05	$1.050	9/30/05	9/30/05	$1.050	$1.050		$0.000	100
PRAMIS Program Management - Planning Common Solutions 2	9/30/06	$0.600	9/30/06	9/30/05	$0.333	$0.276		-$0.057	100
Grants Administration and Oversight - Phase 3	9/30/06	$2.600	9/30/06	9/30/06	$3.250:	$2.760		-$0.480	100
Strategic Information Management - Phase 2	9/30/06	$1.000	9/30/06	9/30/06	$0.250	$0.252		$0.010	100
eGov Initiatives	9/30/06	$1.200	9/30/06	9/30/06	$0.290	$0.390		$0.090	100
Identity Management - Corporate Directory Phase 2	9/30/06	$0.800	9/30/06	9/30/06	$0.660	$0.520		-$0.150	100
Facilities Tracking - Phase 2	9/30/06	$0.200	12/31/06		$0.152				90
Project Reports - Development Phase	9/30/06	$0.700	12/31/06		;$1.490:				80
Develop an inventory of current sources and contractual obligations for information security products and services.	12/31/05	$0.001	12/31/05		$0.001				
Develop a business case for NSF becoming a GMLoB Consortium Lead (i.e., service provider for other Federal grant-making agencies).	9/30/06	$0.243	9/30/06	9/30/06	$0.243	$0.243		$0.000	100
Maintenance FY2006	9/30/06	$3.100	9/30/06	9/30/06	$1.110	$1.050		-$0.050	100

Total Planned Costs: Total Actual Costs: $18.003