

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

- 1. Date of Submission: 9/10/2007
- 2. Agency: Environmental Protection Agency
- 3. Bureau: Office Of The Chief Financial Officer
- 4. Name of this Capital Asset: BY09 Passback - Financial Replacement System (FinRS)
- 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 020-00-01-01-01-1126-00
- 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 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? FY2002

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:

The Financial Replacement Systems (FinRS) investment is the EPA Office of the Chief Financial Officer's (OCFO's) ongoing modular approach to replace its Legacy Financial Systems (LFS). Through the OCFO's operational analysis of LFS, users indicated that EPA's financial systems had the following shortcomings: 1) inconsistent data, 2) limited system interoperability, 3) information latency, 4) multiple reporting systems, 5) low system usability, 6) proliferation of cuff systems, and 7) costly maintenance. The modernized financial system will eliminate repetitive data entry, integrate systems, enable EPA staff to manage workflow among OCFO business lines and between OCFO and related business lines (e.g., acquisitions and grants management), and maximize usage of enabling technologies, e-Government initiatives, and EPA enterprise initiatives. These changes will improve overall efficiency and effectiveness and align with the PMA goal of simplifying service delivery.

Since the FinRS inception in 2002, EPA has accomplished several milestones in modernizing its financial systems including migrating its payroll systems to DFAS under ePayroll, and constructing an administrative data warehouse (ADW) to manage data and ensure financial data integrity. EPA is currently migrating its travel services to GovTrip under eTravel. In FY07, in alignment with OMB's FMLoB, EPA issued an award to a Shared Service Provider (SSP) to manage and host the Agency's core financial system (the largest FinRS component). The award was protested and GAO sustained/approved the protest. EPA is currently reviewing the GAO decision and working to resolve the protest. EPA assumes the protest will be resolved by the end of 2007, enabling implementation to begin, [Redacted]

The fully realized FinRS will enable effective decision-making by capturing and accounting for business event information, ensuring budgetary integrity, and establishing financial control over obligations and costs, performance, other financial assets, and information. These activities will produce accurate and comprehensive financial data to facilitate the OCFO's mission of providing "leadership in financial and performance-based management to achieve a cleaner, healthier environment" in support of the Agency's overall mission of protecting human health and the environment.

- 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 8/29/2007
- 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
- 11. Contact information of Project Manager?
 - Name: Ouverson, Terry
 - Phone Number: 202-564-8344
 - Email: ouverson.terry@epa.gov
- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? TBD
- 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

<p>b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)</p> <p>1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?</p> <p>2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?</p> <p>3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives?</p> <p>If "yes," check all that apply:</p> <p>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?)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Expanded E-Government Financial Performance Budget Performance Integration</p> <p>FinRS integrates strategic planning and budget information with performance data to measure results. The core financial system is being replaced in accordance with Financial Management Line of Business guidance. The payroll function was transferred to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service in May 2006. The travel function is migrating to an eTravel provider. FinRS is also aligned with the Grants.gov, Integrated Acquisition Environment, E-Security, and E-Authorization initiatives.</p>
<p>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.)</p> <p>a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review?</p> <p>b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?</p> <p>c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>15. Is this investment for information technology?</p> <p>If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.</p> <p>For information technology investments only:</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)</p>	<p>Level 2</p>
<p>17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)</p>	<p>(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment</p>
<p>18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>19. Is this a financial management system?</p> <p>a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?</p> <p>1. If "yes," which compliance area:</p> <p>2. If "no," what does it address?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>1. Compliance with Federal accounting standards (e.g. FASAB #4); 2. Compliance with Federal financial management system requirements; 3. Compliance with the US Standard General Ledger (US SGL) at the transaction level</p>
<p>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</p> <p>FDW - Financial Data Warehouse ORBIT - OCFO's Reporting and Business Intelligence Tool PPL - Payroll Personnel and Labor (PeoplePlus) TM - Travel Manager BAS - Budget Automation System (moved from the LFS investment and included in the Planning component)</p>	
<p>20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)</p> <p>Hardware</p>	<p>1</p>

Software 5
 Services 94
 Other

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 Hutt, Judy
 Phone Number 202-566-1668
 Title Agency Privacy Act Officer
 E-mail hutt.judy@epa.gov

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 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	14.257	0							
Acquisition:	31.647	23.804							
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	45.904	23.804							
Operations & Maintenance:	20.623	7.801							
TOTAL:	66.527	31.605							
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	15.141	3.281							
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	144	29							

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? No

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

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:
 EPA issued the FSMP Request for Proposals (RFP) on January 6, 2006 and received proposals on March 7, 2006. EPA awarded the contract to CGI Federal on February 12, 2007, and a bid protest was filed on February 26, 2007. GAO sustained/approved the bid protest on June 4, 2007, and EPA is currently reviewing the GAO decision and working to resolve the protest. EPA assumes the bid protest will be resolved by the end of calendar 2007. Total FinRS development costs increased as a result of: (1) more specific cost estimates based on the contract proposals received, and (2) cost risk adjustments that consider the uncertainty surrounding the FSMP contract award.

The Summary of Spending table includes budgeted costs for IT support services provided through EPA's Working Capital Fund (WCF) while the Acquisition/Contract Strategy table does not.

In order to compare the milestone costs in the Summary of Spending table to the Cost and Schedule Performance Table (section II.C), these two tables need to cover the same time period. The Summary of Spending covers full life cycle costs

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Financial Replacement System (FinRS) (Revision 9)

from inception (approximately FY 1999) through final system retirement in FY 2024. The milestones in section II.C, however, start in FY 2004 and include O&M costs through FY 2009. EPA sent to OMB an interim rebaselining request on June 19, 2007, and on August 2, 2007 OMB denied the request. As a result, the Table in section II.C does not reflect the delay in implementation of the FSMP and Cost Recovery and Imaging components by one year over last year's Exhibit 300 schedule. Once the bid protest is resolved and the contract is awarded, EPA will conduct an Integrated Baseline Review (IBR) and request a full rebaselining to align with the IBR results.

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: BY09 Passback - Financial Replacement System (FinRS) (Revision 9)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:															* Costs in millions	
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level (Level 1,2,3,N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N)
GS-35F4984H, BPA-03-IT-0003	Firm Fixed Price or T&M	Yes	11/25/2003	3/12/2004	9/30/2007	16	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Darry, Deborah	(202) 564-5459 / darry.deborah@epa.gov	Level 3	
EP-W-05-023, TaskOrder 0012 (Total value of contract is \$128M. Total ceiling value of task order is .688M)	Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity	Yes	4/15/2005	7/1/2007	4/14/2010	0.329	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Schermerhorn, Tiffany	202-564-9902 / schermerhorn.tiffany@epa.gov	Level 3	
GS-35F-0306J, BPA-03-OCFOIFMS-01	Firm Fixed Price or T&M	Yes	9/22/2003	9/22/2003	9/30/2008	8.8	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Nolte, Kami	202-564-6652 / nolte.kami@epa.gov	Level 3	
EPO6H01766	Labor/Hour	Yes	5/19/2006	5/19/2006	9/30/2007	0.79	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Richardson, Chanel	202-564-4789 / richardson.chanel@epa.gov	Level 3	
GS-09K9-9BHD0002, Task Order 15	Time and Materials	Yes	7/20/2006	8/22/2006	8/21/2010	4.146	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Caesar, Sandra	202-564-5390 / caesar.sandra@epa.gov	Level 3	
EP-W-07-024	Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity	Yes	2/12/2007	2/12/2007	2/11/2017	84.1	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Caesar, Sandra	202-564-5390 / caesar.sandra@epa.gov	Level 3	
GS-33F-N0018, Task Order 1100 (GSA E-Travel)	Firm Fixed Price	Yes	12/16/2004	12/20/2004	11/11/2008	0.6	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Growney, Matthew	513-487-2029 / growney.matthew@epa.gov	Level 3	

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Financial Replacement System (FinRS) (Revision 9)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level (Level 1,2,3,N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N)
EPO7H000505 8(a) sole source	Task Order/Labor Hours/PBSC	Yes	12/20/2006	1/1/2007	12/31/2009	1.108	No	Yes	No	NA	No	Yes	Cesar, Sandra	202-564-5390 / Cesar.Sandra@epa.gov	Level 3	
GS-35F-0151L	Time & materials	Yes	2/28/2007	3/1/2007	2/29/2008	1.999	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Darry, Deborah	(202) 564-5459 / darry.deborah@epa.gov	Level 3	

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:

GS-33F-N0018: EPA is migrating to a new travel system under the eTravel initiative. Under this initiative, EPA was instructed to select from three vendors who all contracted with GSA. EPA selected Northrop Grumman, and Northrop Grumman is performing migration activities for EPA under the GSA master contract. This master contract, GS-33F-N0018, which was negotiated by GSA, does not require EVM.

EP06H01766, EP07H000505 and GS-35F-0151L: Do not require EVM. In accordance with OMB Memorandum M-05-23 dated August 4, 2005 titled, "Improving Information Technology (IT) Project Planning and Execution," all IT projects will use an approved EVMS except "for steady state projects, [which] perform operational analyses." The FinRS components supported by these contracts are in the operational or steady state phase of the system life-cycle and therefore do not require the use of an EVMS. EPA periodically performs operational analysis for these components to comply with the OMB Memorandum M-05-23, the 1997 OMB Capital Programming Guide, and internal EPA guidance. This analysis determines whether these components are meeting program objectives and the needs of the owners and users, as well as performing within baseline cost, schedule and performance goals.

All other FinRS contracts require EVM.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why: All contracts and task orders include the Section 508 requirement that procured products are accessible to employees & members of the public with disabilities. When compliance imposes undue burden, EPA provides alternative means of access, including a mix of assistance technology (screen readers, Braille devices, specialized keyboards), hardware (compatibility with screen readers and Braille devices, high resolution monitor readability, one-handed operation), & software (eg, closed captioning).

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

a. If "yes," what is the date? 11/21/2005

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

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY 2009.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Response Time	2.0 hours Average time elapsed between opening and closing a trouble ticket	1.5 hours Average time elapsed between opening and closing a trouble ticket	As of April 2007, the average elapsed time was 1.23 hours
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Accounting	Accounting	100% unqualified annual audit opinion by external auditors indicating Excellence in Management Practices relating to Financial Management	100% unqualified annual audit opinion by external auditors	To be determined in 1Q FY 2008
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency	1.5 hours Total elapsed time to	1.4 hours Reduce the	As of April 2007, the elapsed time

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Financial Replacement System (FinRS) (Revision 9)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
						produce SF-224 Statement of Transactions	elapsed time to produce the report	was 1.17 hours
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Availability	95% Availability of IFMS during core working hours	96% Availability of IFMS during core working hours	As of April 2007, the IFMS availability was 96%
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Accuracy of Service or Project Delivered	75% of "satisfactory" or better scores issued by respondents on system usability post-training	80% of "satisfactory" or better scores	To be determined in 1Q FY 2009
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Response Time	1.5 Hours Average time elapsed between opening and closing a trouble Ticket	1.3 Hours average time elapsed between opening and closing a trouble ticket	To be determined in 1Q FY 2009
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Accounting	Accounting	100% unqualified annual audit opinion by external auditors indicating Excellence in Management Practices relating to Financial Management	100% unqualified annual audit opinion by external auditors	To be determined in 1Q FY 2009
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency	1.4 hours Total elapsed time to produce SF-224 Statement of Transactions	1.2 hours Total elapsed time to produce the report	To be determined in 1Q FY 2009
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Availability	96% Availability of IFMS during core working hours	97% Availability of IFMS during core working hours	To be determined in 1Q FY 2009
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	80% of "satisfactory" or better scores issued by respondents on system usability post-training	85% of "satisfactory" or better scores	
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Response Time	1.3 Hours Average time elapsed between opening and closing a trouble ticket	1.2 Hours Average time elapsed between opening and closing a trouble ticket	
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Accounting	Accounting	100% unqualified annual audit opinion by external auditors indicating Excellence in Management Practices relating to Financial Management	100% unqualified annual audit opinion by external auditors	
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency	1.2 hours total elapsed time to produce SF-224 Statement of Transactions	1.0 hours total elapsed time to produce the report	
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Availability	97% Availability of IFMS during core working hours	98% Availability of IFMS during core working hours	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part 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)
Administrative Data Warehouse/ADAM	Contractor Only		
Cost Recovery and Imaging	Contractor Only		
Financial COTS	Contractor Only		
Planning	Contractor Only		

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, NIST 800-26, Other, N/A)	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Administrative Data Warehouse/ADAM	Contractor Only	Moderate	Yes	4/20/2007	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/11/2006	1/29/2007
Financial Data Warehouse	Government Only	Moderate	Yes	9/15/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/22/2006	2/2/2007
ORBIT	Contractor Only	Moderate	Yes	8/25/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/22/2006	1/29/2007
Payroll Personnel and Labor Component	Contractor Only	Moderate	Yes	4/21/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/22/2006	1/29/2007
Planning	Contractor Only	Moderate	Yes	6/30/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/21/2006	6/13/2007
Travel Manager	Government Only	Moderate	Yes	9/15/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/19/2006	7/17/2007

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? Yes

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

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
Administrative Data Warehouse/ADAM	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
Cost Recovery and Imaging	Yes	No	This is a future planned system not yet in the acquisition phase	No	Because the system is not operational, the SORN is not yet required to be published
Financial COTS	Yes	Yes	This system is in the acquisition phase and is not yet operational	No	Because the system is not operational, the SORN is not yet required to be published
Financial Data Warehouse	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
ORBIT	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
Payroll Personnel and Labor	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	Yes	http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-01.htm
Planning	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
Travel Manager	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	Yes	http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-29.htm
Details for Text Options:					
Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.					
Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.					
Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.					

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

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

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes

a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? No

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

b. If "no," please explain why?

EPA requested rebaseline approval from OMB in April 2007 for the FinRS investment which was also excluded from the Agency's February 2007 Sequencing Plan and Transition Strategy submission. The next version of the Agency's Sequencing Plan and Transition Strategy will be updated to reflect the FinRS investment.

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture?

a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

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)
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that allow the classification of data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Classification			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the removal of incorrect or unnecessary characters and data from a data source.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Cleansing			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the restoration and stabilization of data sets to a consistent, desired state.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Recovery			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the archiving and storage of large volumes of data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Warehouse			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the manipulation and change of data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Extraction and Transformation			No Reuse	1
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the population of a data source with external data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Loading and Archiving			No Reuse	1
FinRS	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	1
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the organization of data from separate data sources into a single source using middleware or application integration and the modification of system data models to capture new information	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Data Integration			No Reuse	1

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Financial Replacement System (FinRS) (Revision 9)

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)
	within a single system.							
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the redesigning of disparate information systems into one system that uses a common set of data structures and rules.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Enterprise Application Integration			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the communication between newer generation hardware/software applications and the previous, major generation of hardware/software applications.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Legacy Integration			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support a defined, specified set of finance-related tasks for a given objective.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Activity-Based Management			No Reuse	8
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the examination and verification of records for accuracy.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Auditing			No Reuse	8
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the charging, collection and reporting of an organization's accounts.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting			No Reuse	8
E-Gov: FMLoB Partner Contribution	Develop a common government-wide accounting code structure, including an applicable set of definitions and the layout, which federal agencies' new financial systems must adhere.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting	Billing and Accounting	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	External	0
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of credit cards or electronic funds transfers for payment and collection of products or services.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Credit / Charge			No Reuse	8
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the calculations and difference between multiple mediums of exchange.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Currency Translation			No Reuse	1

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Financial Replacement System (FinRS) (Revision 9)

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)
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the process of accounts receivable.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Debt Collection			No Reuse	8
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the management and reimbursement of costs paid by employees or an organization.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Expense Management			No Reuse	8
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the process of accounts payable.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Payment / Settlement			No Reuse	9
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that involve the administration and determination of employees compensation.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Payroll			No Reuse	6
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the allocation and re-investment of earned net credit or capital within an organization.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Revenue Management			No Reuse	9
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support and analyze information and predict the impact of decisions before they are made.	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Decision Support and Planning			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support and analyze information and predict the impact of decisions before they are made.	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Decision Support and Planning			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of dynamic reports on an as needed basis.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the analysis of information that has been summarized into multidimensional views and hierarchies.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	OLAP			No Reuse	1
Portal/Extract; Transform and Load Tool (ETL) Tool (PETL)	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of pre-conceived or pre-written reports.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned	Extraction and Transformation	020-00-01-16-02-6029-00	Internal	1
E-Gov: FMLoB Partner Contribution	Develop performance measures (cost,	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Performance Management	Performance Management	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	External	0

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Financial Replacement System (FinRS) (Revision 9)

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)
	quality, timeliness) to assess the performance of financial services offered by a financial service organization.							
FinRS	Support the administration of a group of investments held by an organization.	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Portfolio Management			No Reuse	1
FinRS	Support the determination of long-term goals and the identification of the best approach for achieving those goals.	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Strategic Planning and Mgmt			No Reuse	2
E-Gov: FMLoB Partner Contribution	Develop standard business processes, data specifications and business rules for core financial management functions (e.g. funds management, payments, receipts and reporting) to be adopted by all federal agencies.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Business Rule Management	Business Rule Management	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	External	0

- 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)
Activity-Based Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Business Rule Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Credit / Charge	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Currency Translation	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Expense Management	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Debt Collection	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Financial Replacement System (FinRS) (Revision 9)

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)
Decision Support and Planning	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
OLAP	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Decision Support and Planning	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Auditing	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Billing and Accounting	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Payroll	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Revenue Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Strategic Planning and Mgmt	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Portfolio Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Data Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
Data Classification	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Data Recovery	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Extraction and Transformation	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	
Data Cleansing	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Meta Data Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Legacy Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	

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.

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

FinRS leverages many components and applications across the Government in accordance with President's E-Government Strategy. Currently FinRS already leverages the Defense Financial and Accounting Service (DFAS) for payroll. This transition occurred in FY 2006 and will remain in place throughout the lifecycle of the investment. In addition, FinRS leverages E-Travel for travel services, and is aligned with the Grants.gov, Integrated Acquisition Environment, E-Security and E-Authorization initiatives, which are all E-Gov initiatives.

Furthermore, FinRS is replacing the Agency's core financial system in alignment with the the Financial Management Line of Business (FM LoB) objectives and guidance. Because the FM LoB is a government-wide initiative for financial management improvement, EPA will ensure that it implements a financial system solution consistent with the FM LoB vision: to establish the framework for a government-wide financial management solution that is efficient and improves business performance while ensuring integrity in accountability, financial controls, and mission effectiveness. In this way, the goals identified for the FM LoB provide the underpinnings for EPA's FinRS plan:

- Achieve or enhance process improvements and cost savings in the acquisition, development, implementation, and operation of financial management systems through shared services, joint procurements, consolidation, and other means
- Provide for standardization of business processes and data elements
- Promote seamless data exchange between and among federal agencies
- Strengthen internal controls through real-time interoperability of core financial and subsidiary systems.

By supporting the FM LoB and other Presidential E-Government Strategic initiatives, FinRS is leveraging various components and applications across the government to accomplish its mission in the most efficient and effective manner.

EPA contributes approx. \$45K annually to the government-wide FM LoB effort. In its new financial system implementation, EPA will reuse the following FSIO products:

- Performance measures (cost, quality, timeliness) to assess the performance of financial services offered by a financial service organization;
- Standard business processes, data specifications and business rules for core financial management functions (e.g. funds management, payments, receipts and reporting) to be adopt by all federal agencies;

-Common government-wide accounting code structure.

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? 6/18/2007
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results: * 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 Shared Service Provider (SSP)			
Alternative 2 Agency Hosted COTS solution			
Alternative 3 Legacy System Upgrade			
Baseline			

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

Alternative 1 was chosen because it has the best combination of benefit, cost and risk.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

- Improve Financial Performance
- Continue to align with FM LoB e-gov initiative
 - Incorporate best practices through periodic FSIO-compliant updates/upgrades
 - Meet existing laws and regulations
 - Consolidate financial systems and core financial functionality
 - Reengineer processes to meet core finance and payroll best business practices
 - Produce not only quarterly but monthly financial statements
 - Meet OMB and Treasury requirements more efficiently
 - Consolidate debt collection functionality and follow debt collection best practices
 - Automate time and attendance (T&A) processing resulting in less adjustments per month
 - Reduce manual T&A processing resulting in less data entry errors and corrections
 - Reduce the amount of EPA support for numerous cuff applications as they are replaced
 - Route documents electronically between integrated systems
- Improve Financial Service to the Customer
- Provide interoperability between agencies with XML
 - Provide a single point of access to government services through the administrative data warehouse
 - Consolidate financial functionality to minimize redundancy and maximize integration
 - Provide robust editing, real-time data, reporting capabilities, web-accessibility, and a modern development environment
 - Provide Business Intelligence tools for common services coupled with use of web-designed applications
 - Enhance the ability to provide common, efficient administrative services
 - Provide the ability to make payments of all kinds
 - Provide the ability to manage funds on-line
 - Support electronic business processes
 - Automate payroll processes to reduce pay statement generation from 7 to 3 days
 - Speed up the travel management process and achieve faster reimbursements
- Maintain a Secure Financial Systems Environment
- Ensure a secure systems environment through the use of newer and more integrated technologies
 - Provide the ability to integrate digital signatures for transactions
- Improve Financial Accountability
- Maintain compliance with accounting standards and produce annual financial statements
 - Institute cost management/accounting techniques to provide more timely and useful information for managing program resources
- Improve Budget and Performance Integration
- Provide tailored budget formulation functionality

-Integrate financial and performance information

A number of these qualitative benefits will become quantitative benefits as FinRS components move from acquisition to development.

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part 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:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement

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? 8/16/2006
 - 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:

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) Yes
 - a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both? SV
 - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:

The Financial COTS and Planning components of FinRS are approximately 15 months behind the baseline schedule. While the Financial COTS and Planning component baseline schedules assumed the contract/Interagency Agreement would be awarded in March 2006, EPA believed the actual award would be made during the first quarter of FY 2007, before the ever-growing FinRS negative schedule variance reached 10 percent. EPA issued the FinRS Request for Proposals (RFP) on January 6, 2006 and received proposals on March 7, 2006. EPA awarded the contract to CGI Federal on February 12, 2007, and a bid protest was filed on February 26, 2007. GAO sustained/approved the bid protest on June 4, 2007, and EPA is currently reviewing the GAO decision and working to resolve the protest. EPA assumes the bid protest will be resolved by the end of calendar 2007. Throughout the acquisition process EPA worked with OMB to ensure FinRS closely aligned with the FM LoB migration strategy. OMB changes to the COE Due Diligence Checklist, changes in contract type, and unanticipated Circular A-76 discussions impacted the FinRS acquisition schedule. EPA was the first federal agency to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) to both federal Shared Services Centers and private firms to implement and host a new core financial system. While EPA attempted to realistically estimate the proposal review process schedule, the lack of precedence and the complexity of the procurement made the review process difficult to estimate. EPA requested permission to rebaseline FinRS, and on August 2, 2007, OMB denied the request except that OMB allowed EPA to add milestones for FY 2009 O&M amounts.

c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:

Assuming the FinRS bid protest is resolved by December 2007, EPA plans to complete the Integrated Baseline Review (IBR)

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Financial Replacement System (FinRS) (Revision 9)

promptly after the Product Acceptance Test. Following the IBR, EPA plans to complete a full rebaselining of the FinRS investment. In the meantime, EPA sent to OMB an interim rebaselining request on June 19, 2007, and on August 2, 2007, OMB denied the request except that OMB allowed EPA to add milestones for FY 2009 O&M amounts. EPA will continue to carefully monitor the schedule variance, and will complete a full FinRS rebaselining following the bid protest resolution and IBR completion.

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			
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14	EAI: FY 2005 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.21	\$0.333889	0	\$-0.123889	100%
15	EAI: FY 2006 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0.33	\$0.779026	0	\$-0.449026	100%
16	EAI: FY 2007 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2007		\$0.79	\$0.741556		\$-0.280749	58.33%
17										
18										
18										
19	ADW: BPR			6/23/2005	10/16/2005	\$0.23	\$0.226902	-115	\$0.003098	100%
20										

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			
21										
23	ADW: ADAM			8/31/2004	8/15/2004	\$0.69	\$0.640614	16	\$0.049386	100%
24	ADW: FY 04/05 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.95	\$1.119192	0	\$-0.169192	100%
25	ADW: ADAM 06 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$1.41	\$1.504034	0	\$-0.094034	100%
26	ADW: ADAM FY 07 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2007		\$1.63	\$0.471326		\$0.479453	58.33%
27										
28										
28	ADW: ORBIT phase I	11/30/2004	\$2.8	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$2.35	\$1.988413	0	\$0.361587	100%
29	ADW: ORBIT phase II	11/30/2005	\$0.7	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$2.14	\$0.925010	0	\$1.214990	100%
30	ADW: ORBIT phase III			9/29/2006		\$1.3	\$1.276236		\$-0.107536	89.9%
31	ADW: ORBIT FY 2004 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$0.35	\$0.115689	0	\$0.234311	100%
32	ADW: ORBIT FY 2005 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.99	\$0.795386	0	\$0.194614	100%
33	ADW: ORBIT FY 2006 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$1.01	\$0.736493	0	\$0.273507	100%
34	ADW: ORBIT FY 2007 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2007		\$1.03	\$0.776867		\$-0.176068	58.33%
35	ADW: ORBIT FY 2008 Operations			9/30/2008		\$1.05	\$0		\$0	0%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	& Maintenance									
36	ePayroll Migration			3/31/2006	5/29/2006	\$5.675	\$7.854642	-59	\$-2.179642	100%
37	eTravel Migration	2/15/2004	\$0.1	12/31/2006		\$1.61	\$1.241175		\$-0.048326	74.09%
38	PPL Org, Change/BPR, System Build and Test, Implementation	9/30/2003	\$13.4	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$19.1	\$19.098898	0	\$0.001102	100%
39	PPL FY 04/05			9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$4.87	\$5.707730	0	\$-0.837730	100%
40	PPL FY 06 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$4.04	\$5.552482	0	\$-1.512482	100%
41	PPL FY 07 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2007		\$4.11	\$2.49028		\$-0.092917	58.33%
42	PPL FY 08 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2008		\$4.19	\$0		\$0	0%
43	FDW FY 04 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$0.39	\$0.4723	0	\$-0.0823	100%
43	PPL: FY 09 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2009		\$2.57				0%
44	FDW FY 05 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.41	\$0.447674	0	\$-0.037674	100%
45	FDW FY 06 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0.42	\$0.505718	0	\$-0.085718	100%
46	FDW FY 07 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2007		\$0.42	\$0.347669		\$-0.102683	58.33%

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			
47	FDW FY 08 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2008		\$0.43	\$0		\$0	0%
48	FDW: FY 09 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2009		\$0.64				0%
48	TM FY 04 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$0.48	\$0.3231	0	\$0.1569	100%
49	TM FY 05 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.52	\$0.335095	0	\$0.184905	100%
50	TM FY 06 Operations & Maintenance			9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0.28	\$0.517267	0	\$-0.237267	100%
51	FY 2005 on-going security assessments and POAM development and monitoring for FinRS components			9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.46	\$0.481468	0	\$-0.021468	100%
52	FY 2006 on-going security assessments and POAM development and monitoring for FinRS components			9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0.53	\$0.41553	0	\$0.11447	100%
53	FY 2007 on-going security assessments and POAM development			9/30/2007		\$1.06	\$0.258816		\$0.359482	58.33%

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			
	and monitoring for FinRS components									
54	Develop an inventory of current sources and contractual obligations for information security products and services			12/31/2005	12/31/2005	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	100%
55	Develop migration plan for acquiring information security products and services from Centers of Excellence established under the information Systems Security Line of Business			9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	100%
Project Totals										