

**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 Prevention, Pesticides And Toxic Substan
- 4. Name of this Capital Asset: BY09 Passback - Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM)
- 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 020-00-01-14-01-1030-00
- 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.) Planning
- 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2006

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 Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM) supports EPA Strategic Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems, Objective 4.1: Chemical and Pesticide Risks, by providing a single, web-enabled portal for all pesticide data, communications, registrations and transactions. PRISM will enable EPA's stakeholders to increase chemical and pesticide screenings, minimize manual chemical tolerance assessments, and increase data validation - resulting in reduced chemical and pesticide risks.

Currently, EPA's mission is supported by the Office of Pesticide Programs Information Network (OPPIN), a group of stand-alone, legacy applications that lack the speed and functionality needed by EPA. The Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) has migrated its major data systems including regulatory and scientific data, workflow, and document management into OPPIN. However, OPPIN presents mission and performance gaps: insufficient data integration, inadequate database design, and system accessibility and usability issues. These functional and service limitations reduce EPA's ability to deliver information to the right people at the right time, and therefore best serve EPA's customers. PRISM will offset these mission and performance gaps by instituting and enforcing data quality standards; providing a structured, fully integrated database; and improving system performance, accessibility, and document management.

FY09 funding will support security, planning, hardware & software acquisition, development & support services, and maintenance. To fund hardware, EPA will leverage efficiencies with existing data systems. EPA FTE support, comprising 23% of lifecycle costs, will be a major component of the PRISM investment. Planning began in FY05 using Government FTE resources.

PRISM is fundamental to EPA's EA and supports the PMA through Expanded E-Government. PRISM provides an integrated, technically sound environment that enables EPA personnel with a secure and accurate system that facilitates information automation and sharing, and stakeholder collaboration

- 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: Jones, Quentin
  - Phone Number: 703-308-0097
  - Email: jones.quentin@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

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM) (Revision 8)

- a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? Yes
- b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) No
1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?
3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?
13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? Yes
- If "yes," check all that apply: Expanded E-Government
- a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s) (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?) PRISM directly supports the PMA through Expanded Electronic Government by web-enabling and automating data collection, information sharing, information dissemination and reporting. By providing a consolidated, web-based data system, PRISM increases the availability and accessibility of critical EPA data, which reduces the burden to the Federal government and improves service to stakeholders.
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](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part).) Yes
- a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? Yes
- b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? PRISM supports 2 PARTed programs: Pesticide Registration and Pesticide Reregistration. Each program received an "Adequate" rating.
- c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Adequate
15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes
- If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.
- For information technology investments only:
16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 2
17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) (1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) No
19. Is this a financial management system? No
- a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFIA compliance area?
1. If "yes," which compliance area:
2. If "no," what does it address?
- b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52
20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)
- |          |    |
|----------|----|
| Hardware | 3  |
| Software | 45 |
| Services | 26 |
| Other    | 26 |
21. If this project produces information dissemination N/A

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?

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:	0.43	0.73	0.975	0.492					
Acquisition:	1.963	4.425	5.8	3.851					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	2.393	5.155	6.775	4.343					
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0	0	0.8					
TOTAL:	2.393	5.155	6.775	5.143					
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	1.117	1.08	1.34	1.82					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	9	9	10	14					

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:

In FY2006 and FY2007, the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) negotiated contracts for the PRISM investment, as well as underwent a physical office relocation that included all IT infrastructure associated with the PRISM investment. The negotiations and office relocation interrupted planned development and support services for PRISM. Additionally, OPP began planning for anticipated requirements changes to PRISM to reflect the forthcoming Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act (PRIA II) legislation, which was finalized in the first quarter of FY2008. These activities required additional planning in FY2006 and FY2007, which deferred baselined development work. Accordingly, the PRISM investment exhibited a schedule variance of 32%.

The proposed rebaseline shifted planned FY2006 and FY2007 spending to the out-years, thus rescinding the schedule variance (SV) that was carried through Quarter 3 in FY2007.

However, OMB directed PRISM to modify the re-baseline request to extend the PRISM schedule by only 6 months, rather than the original 12 month request. Following OMB's guidance, PRISM modified the re-baseline to extend the baseline by 6 months and provided that new baseline with no variance in the BY2009 business case.

The final six-month rebaseline reduced the baseline costs in FY2006 and FY2007 to reflect the reduced development scope in FY2006 and FY2007, as well as capture increased planning. The re-baseline was approved by the Agency head on June 21, 2007, and subsequently by OMB on August 30, 2007.

Additionally, PRISM's total spending does not match annual budgetary allocations in the Exhibit 53 because portions of PRISM funding are derived from fee-based pesticide registration revenue in the Office of Pesticide Programs.

***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 - Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM) (Revision 8)

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)
BPA OARMSC-SYS-04/EPA07D000110	FFP	Yes	11/29/2006	11/30/2006	11/29/2007	0.243	No	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes	Robbins, Steve	702-305-6439 / robbins.steve@epamail.epa.gov	Level 3	
GS-06F-0337Z	T&M	Yes	6/15/2006	7/1/2006	3/31/2011	4.556	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Darry, Deborah	(202) 564-5459 / darry.deborah@epa.gov	Level 3	
68-W-03-050	CPAF	Yes	6/16/2006	7/1/2006	9/30/2008	4.893	No	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes	Nolte, Kami	202-564-6652 / nolte.kami@epa.gov	Level 3	
GS-35F-0799M/EP07D000102	FFP	Yes	12/1/2006	6/1/2007	11/30/2008	0.75	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Lloyd, Dana	919-541-0532 / lloyd.dana@epa.gov	Level 3	
EP05W003589	CPAF	Yes	9/30/2006	10/1/2007	3/31/2011	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Nolte, Christopher	202-564-1125 / Nolte.Christopher@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:

Earned Value reporting will be a requirement of all contracts awarded under PRISM. On all future contract awards, which are represented by contract line item #6 in the preceding table, Earned Value reporting and competitive, performance-based contract awards will be utilized.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes
- a. Explain why: EPA requires all contracts to comply with applicable Section 508 standards. EPA systems must demonstrate complete 508 compliance before submission to the EPA Maintenance Review Board. 508 compliance reviews are performed with system releases and on an ad hoc basis. The EPA Enterprise Architecture (EA) chairs the change control board and has unique authority to reject systems that do not comply with the EPA EA and standards.
4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes
- a. If "yes," what is the date? 10/30/2005
- 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](http://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	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Increase Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically through reduction in the reliance upon manual counts to measure the number of tolerances related to pesticides registrants and the reduction of risks to the public	87.7% of total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically	91.2% of total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically	To be determined in 1Q FY2008
2007	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Pollution Prevention and Control	Increase the number of screened commercial and/or industrial chemicals in the U.S. inventory in order to prevent or reduce chemical risks	50% or more of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed	70% of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed	To be determined in 1Q FY2008
2007	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Increase OPP data reviewed and validated through system integration and standardization to ensure that	85% of cumulative OPP data has been reviewed and validated for integration into the PRISM	90% of cumulative OPP data reviewed and validated for integration into the PRISM platform	To be determined in 1Q FY2008

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM) (Revision 8)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					incoming data is consistent (LUIS, TESS, CDX, Workflow)	platform		
2007	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase the number of documents managed within a document management system	50% of cumulative OPP documents are managed in a document management environment	70% of cumulative OPP documents are managed in a document management environment	To be determined in 1Q FY2008
2008	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Increase Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically through reduction in the reliance upon manual counts to measure the number of tolerances related to pesticides registrants and the reduction of risks to the public	91.2% of total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically	94.2% of total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically	To be determined in 1Q FY2009
2008	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Pollution Prevention and Control	Increase the number of screened commercial and/or industrial chemicals in the U.S. inventory in order to prevent or reduce chemical risks	Greater than 70% of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed	Greater than 90% of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed	To be determined in 1Q FY2009
2008	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Increase OPP data reviewed and validated through system integration and standardization to ensure that incoming data is consistent (LUIS, TESS, CDX, Workflow)	90% of cumulative OPP data has been reviewed and validated for integration into the PRISM platform	92% of cumulative OPP data reviewed and validated for integration into the PRISM platform	To be determined in 1Q FY2009
2008	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase the number of documents managed within a document management system	70% of cumulative OPP documents are managed in a document management environment	80% of cumulative OPP documents are managed in a document management environment	To be determined in 1Q FY2009
2009	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Increase Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically through reduction in the reliance upon manual counts to measure the number of tolerances related to pesticides registrants and the reduction of risks to the public.	94.2% of total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically	96.5% of total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically	
2009	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Pollution Prevention and Control	Increase the number of screened commercial and/or industrial chemicals in the U.S. inventory in order to prevent or reduce chemical risks	Greater than 90% of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed	100% of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed	

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2009	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Increase OPP data reviewed and validated through system integration and standardization to ensure that incoming data is consistent (LUIS, TESS, CDX, Workflow)	92% of cumulative OPP data has been reviewed and validated for integration into the PRISM platform	94% of cumulative OPP data reviewed and validated for integration into the PRISM platform	
2009	Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase the number of OPP documents managed within a document management system.	80% of cumulative OPP documents are managed in a document management environment	90% of cumulative OPP documents are managed in a document management environment	

**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: 8
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)
Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM)	Government 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

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

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

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? No

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

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

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM)	Yes	Yes	System does not collect Personally Identifiable Information (PII) on the public. Therefore, the PRISM PIA is not required to be posted to the internet.	No	A SORN is not required for PRISM because it is not a Privacy Act system of records.

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

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

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

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

a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM)

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? No

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

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM) (Revision 8)

**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)
PRISM's Web Portal Development and Interface	PRISM will define the set of capabilities that support the redesigning of disparate pesticide 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	10
PRISM's Systems Management	PRISM will redefine EPA's capabilities that support the organization of pesticide data from separate data sources into a single source using new applications that will allow for the integration and the modification of current and new system data models to capture new and comprehensive pesticide information within a single system.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Legacy Integration	Data Integration	020-00-01-14-01-1020-00	Internal	0
PRISM's Management of Process	PRISM will define and coordinate the hardware and software of systems that contain or record pesticide data to ensure compatibility and accessibility of the data to professionals and citizens.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Configuration Management			No Reuse	5
PRISM's Relationship Management	PRISM will provide a framework to promote the effective collaboration between EPA and its business partners, particularly members of the pesticide distribution chain (e.g. Channel and alliance partners, resellers, agents, brokers, and dealers) and other third parties that are involved with pesticides. PRISM will also allow citizens to access a single portal with data on pesticides and their possible impact on human health and the environment or	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Partner Relationship Management			No Reuse	50

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM) (Revision 8)

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 <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .								
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)
	ecosystems.							
PRISM's Content Management and Maintenance	PRISM will increase EPA's capabilities to manage the storage, maintenance and retrieval of pesticide related documents and information both internally and through EPA's website.	Digital Asset Services	Content Management	Content Review and Approval			No Reuse	25
PRISM's Imaging Management	PRISM will redefine the set of capabilities that support the scanning of physical pesticide related documents for use electronically in its systems and for those available to the citizen at EPA's web site.	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Imaging and OCR			No Reuse	10
PRISM's Customer Help Desk Management	Receive and track user-reported issues and problems with client or citizen use and access to pesticide data while using PRISM including help desk calls.	Support Services	Systems Management	Issue Tracking			No Reuse	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)
Enterprise Application Integration	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Content Review and Approval	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Issue Tracking	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Partner Relationship Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Legacy Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM) (Revision 8)

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)? No

a. If "yes," please describe.

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

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

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A-94 for all investments and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?      Yes
  - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?      6/30/2005
  - 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: <span style="float: right;">* Costs in millions</span>			
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
1 -Component-Based architecture Development			
2 - Limited Development			
3- COTS Replacement			

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

Alternative 1, Component-based Architecture Development, was selected because it provides the greatest overall contribution to fulfilling the EPA mission. EPA considered three criteria (technical, financial, and strategic) when deciding whether to undertake the PRISM investment. The investment selection process included criteria related to the quantitatively expressed projected net, risk-adjusted return on investment, and specific quantitative and qualitative criteria such as Earned Value, ROI, and Net Present Value Analysis for comparing and prioritizing the alternative investments.

(A) Technically, Alternative 1 provides the following application advantages: integrates legacy applications currently missing from OPPIN; eliminates existing stand-alone, pesticide-related applications; improves OPPIN data quality by developing automated data collection mechanisms; creates a web-enabled, customizable, information analysis portal. These advantages result in savings in worker hours resulting from automation of manual processes. PRISM will reduce the number of man hours required to fulfill agency pesticide reporting requirements from an average of 12,000 hours annually for OPPIN to an anticipated 2,400 hours annually for PRISM.

(B) Financially, PRISM's reduced burden through process automation will result in a life cycle cost savings of \$4.5M. Reduction in downtime of the pesticide system(s) will result in a life cycle cost savings of \$2.0M. It is anticipated that maintenance cost avoidance payback will occur in 2009, with a total life cycle cost savings of \$18M. It is anticipated that the PRISM investment will result in a total life cycle savings of approximately \$24M.

(C) Strategically, Alternative 1 will expand e-government by providing a single source portal for pesticide registrant data and will combine elements of critical data, based on all OPP and EPA requirements. In addition, this solution is the only alternative that is consistent with the EPA architecture to provide accessible, secure, responsive, accurate systems, and shared information to support EPA employees and our partnering federal, state and local agencies.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

PRISM will benefit EPA stakeholders (States, citizens, and pesticide registrants) through a reduction in system downtime, workflow and process automation, workload capacity enhancement, and integration of information systems. These improvements will allow EPA to increase the number of screened commercial and/or industrial chemicals in the US inventory from approximately 50% to 100%. PRISM will also increase the percentage of Tolerance Reassessments that are performed electronically from 87% to 98%, which will increase the speed by which EPA identifies, reduces, and communicates risks to the public. Through system integration and information standardization, PRISM will provide the public with more consistent information regarding pesticide risks to human health and the environment. By providing a single, automated, web-enabled portal for information related to pesticide registration, PRISM will simplify the registration process and will provide the stakeholders with consistent, timely, and more complete information and will significantly increase the accessibility of pesticide registration information. By integrating electronic document management functionality, PRISM will increase the number of documents that are controlled in a document management environment from 50% to 95%. The PRISM investment will dramatically reduce system downtime by reducing the need for maintenance and upgrades and will lower the number of monthly help desk tickets, resulting in higher levels of customer and user efficiency and satisfaction. This reduction in downtime will allow EPA to more reliably provide data to its stakeholders.

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? 12/30/2006
  - 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) No
  - a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?
  - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:
  - c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:
- 3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? Yes
  - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? 6/21/2007

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			
5.1	FTE Costs FY05	9/30/2005	\$0.067	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.067	\$0.067	0	\$0	100%
6.1	Planning	12/30/2006	\$0.925	12/30/2006	12/30/2006	\$0.08	\$0.08	0	\$0	100%
6.2	Requirements Analysis and Preliminary Design	12/30/2006	\$0.925	12/30/2006	12/30/2006	\$0.35	\$0.35	0	\$0	100%
6.3	Acquisition of Hardware and Support Services	9/30/2006	\$0.57	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0.843	\$0.843	0	\$0	100%
6.4	Software Design & Development	9/30/2006	\$2.677	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0.3	\$0.3	0	\$0	100%
6.5	Security Planning and Accreditation	9/30/2006	\$0.675	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0.62	\$0.62	0	\$0	100%
6.6	PRISM Business Processes Development	9/30/2006	\$0.2	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0.2	\$0.2	0	\$0	100%
6.7	FTE Costs FY06	9/29/2006	\$0.715	9/29/2006	9/29/2006	\$1.05	\$1.05	0	\$0	100%
7.1	Planning	11/1/2007	\$0.425	11/1/2007		\$0.515	\$0.38625		\$0	75%
7.2	Preliminary Design and Analysis	12/31/2007	\$0.425	12/31/2007		\$0.215	\$0.16125		\$0	75%
7.3	Acquisition of Hardware	9/30/2007	\$0.55	9/30/2007		\$0.55	\$0.4125		\$0	75%
7.4	Software Design and Development	1/2/2008	\$3.975	1/2/2008		\$2.575	\$1.93125		\$0	75%
7.5	Security & Document Preparation	9/30/2007	\$0.7	9/30/2007		\$0.7	\$0.525		\$0	75%
7.6	PRISM Business Processes Development	9/30/2007	\$0.6	9/30/2007		\$0.6	\$0.45		\$0	75%
7.7	FTE Costs FY07	9/28/2007	\$1.08	9/28/2007		\$1.08	\$0.81		\$0	75%

## 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			
8.1	Planning	4/1/2008	\$0.175	4/1/2008		\$0.475			0%	
8.2	Preliminary Design and Analysis	6/2/2008	\$0.175	6/2/2008		\$0.5			0%	
8.3	Acquisition of Hardware and Support Software	9/30/2008	\$0.35	9/30/2008		\$0.35			0%	
8.4	Software Design and Development	9/30/2008	\$3.15	9/30/2008		\$3.15			0%	
8.5	Security-Accreditation Preparation	9/30/2008	\$0.5	9/30/2008		\$0.5			0%	
8.6	PRISM Business Processes Development	9/30/2008	\$1.8	9/30/2008		\$1.8			0%	
8.7	FTE Costs FY08	9/30/2008	\$1.82	9/30/2008		\$1.34			0%	
9.1	Planning	10/1/2008	\$0.1	10/1/2008		\$0.3			0%	
9.2	Preliminary Design and Analysis	4/30/2009	\$0.1	4/30/2009		\$0.192			0%	
9.3	Acquisition of Hardware & Support Services	9/30/2009	\$0.2	9/30/2009		\$0.2			0%	
9.4	Software Design and Development	9/30/2009	\$2.3	9/30/2009		\$3.1			0%	
9.5	Security C&A Preparation and Processing	6/30/2009	\$0.351	6/30/2009		\$0.551			0%	
9.6	PRISM Maintenance	9/30/2009	\$1.8	9/30/2009		\$0.8			0%	
9.7	FTE Costs FY09	9/30/2009	\$1.968	9/30/2009		\$1.82			0%	

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

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