

**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 Solid Waste And Emergency Response
4. Name of this Capital Asset: BY09 Passback - Superfund Document Management System (SDMS)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 020-00-01-13-01-1020-00
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.) O&M
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2001 or earlier
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:
- SDMS is a key EPA asset used to meet responsibilities of Federal agencies, Congress, and the Public in Superfund site remediation and cleanup, and emergency response support. It addresses the Agency's performance gap for capturing, preserving, and disseminating legislatively mandated Superfund documents and records. SDMS is an electronic repository of Superfund documents routinely used to disseminate records in response to FOIA requests, Administrative Records, and for litigation support. These records provide a rich institutional "memory" of the highest importance to the Superfund Program. SDMS advances e-Government by providing reliable and easily accessible documents to citizens for making informed decisions in their communities. Beneficiaries of content exported from SDMS include ordinary citizens, States, Tribes, Congress, and the business community.
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 Wyman, Steven
- Phone Number 703-603-8882
- Email wyman.steve@epa.gov
- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? Yes
- a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? Yes
- b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) No
1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?
3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?
13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA Yes

initiatives?

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?)

SDMS addresses a performance gap in e-Government by providing a digital repository to manage and access Federal fulltext documents and records electronically. The system has been used in high profile emergency response operations, including records capture for the Katrina - Rita Hurricanes EPA response. Digital documents are distributed to many stakeholders including States, Tribes, concerned citizens, the legal community, and other Federal agencies such as US DOJ.

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).)

No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review?

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?

c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?

15. Is this investment for information technology?

Yes

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

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)

Level 2

17. 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 5

Software 5

Services 80

Other 10

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

Yes

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name Hutt, Judy

Phone Number 202-566-1668

Title Agency Privacy Act Officer

E-mail [hutt.judy@epa.gov](mailto: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:	7.305	0.3	0.15	0					
Acquisition:	14.725	0.627	1.15	0					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	22.030	0.927	1.30	0					
Operations & Maintenance:	18.53	3.397	2.1	1.957					
TOTAL:	40.560	4.324	3.40	1.957					
Government FTE Costs	2.509	0.3	0.2	0.22					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	22	3	2	2					

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:  
 The scope of SDMS project work changed during FY07. SDMS was directed by senior management to take on additional project activities regarding integrating the Institutional Controls Tracking System (ICTS). Additionally, SDMS emerged more clearly as the core platform upon which to base the Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS). SDMS has advanced through an intensive development phase to a point where it should be reclassified to the Operations & Maintenance life cycle phase for FY2009. Development work will be complete during FY08.

**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 - Superfund Document Management System (SDMS) (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)
DW-47-93935401	Cost-Plus-Award-Fee, Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee and Firm Fixed Price	Yes	9/1/2002	9/1/2002	9/1/2007	4.6	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	McDowell, Chiara	703-306-7635 / Chiara.McDowell@gsa.gov	Level 3	
68-W-04-005	Cost Plus Incentive Fee	Yes	6/15/2006	6/19/2006	10/31/2007	6.129	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Paul, Dawson	202-564-4473 / dawson.paul@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:

For the two contract vehicles which directly support SDMS, EVM is required at the task order level. The "ITS-ESE" contract in EPA is a systems development support contract. The "ITS-EPA" contract is used operations and maintenance of the production system. This split mirrors the mixed life cycle nature of SDMS. EVM is reported by both contractors monthly.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why:

The ITS-ESE contract requires that the EPA Web Development Guide be adhered to for all web development tasks. The contractor utilizes tools that verify Section 508 compliance and the EPA Office of Public Affairs (OPA) verifies and approves of all public facing web sites and applications. Additionally, 508 compliance for the general system is part of the IT development Task Order itself. The EPA conducted 508 testing of SDMS. Findings were used to make numerous accessibility improvements to SDMS.

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

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

6/13/2002

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
2005	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Post-1995 Administrative Records and 5-Year Reviews accessible in SDMS.	Less than 30% available as of FY04.	15% improvement to at least 45% availability.	69% of 5-Year Reviews are accessible in SDMS. For the last 3 quarters in FY05, 50% ARs were accessible in SDMS.
2005	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	Percentage of post-1995 Superfund NPL and equivalent sites in SDMS and accessible directly to regional staff.	40% as of FY04.	80%	For FY05, 47% of NPL sites are available to Regional staff in SDMS.
2005	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Number Regions implementing SDMS electronic workflow	1 as of FY04.	2 additional Regions	All Regions have it available; but only 3 are using it.
2005	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Number of Regions accepting and processing electronic records.	2 as of FY04.	3 additional Regions	3 Regions and Headquarters regularly capture e-records.
2005	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Regions using combined full text/indexing search	3 as of FY04.	7	10
2005	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or	Number of Regions switched from	3 as of FY04.	Additional 7 Regions	10

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Superfund Document Management System (SDMS) (Revision 9)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
				Mission	16-bit technology to 32-bit*			
2005	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Unique visitors per month (inside firewall)	Approximately 400 per month as of FY04.	Additional 75 users for an average of 475 per month.	Average of 470 visitors per month in FY2005.
2005	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Percentage of sites in SDMS with SDMS document connections from CERCLIS (or a replacement system that tracks performance against strategic objectives)	Approximately 5% as of FY04.	Reach 10%	Still close to 5%
2006	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Percentage of post-1995 Administrative Records and 5-Year Reviews accessible in SDMS.	69% of 5-Year Review and 50% of ARs in FY05	Additional 15% improvement.	During review of 5-Year Reviews generated 2004-2006, over 85% were available in SDMS and over 67% ARs were accessible in SDMS.
2006	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	Percentage of post-1995 Superfund NPL and equivalent sites in SDMS and accessible directly to regional staff.	47% of NPL sites available in SDMS as of FY05.	Reach 100%	Goal not yet met. A national dialog is underway on how to best meet this goal. Funding limitations may require scaling back.
2006	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Management	Disaster Monitoring and Prediction	Regions using Aventail (AAA extranet) for access to SDMS in emergency scenarios	2 Regions with access in FY05	3 additional Regions with access -- 5 total	This is not under the control of SDMS. SDMS has been able to influence multiple regions to upgrade their regional offices to Active Directory, which assists in this matter, and as such, has met the performance goal.
2006	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Number of Regions implementing and utilizing SDMS electronic workflow	3 Regions added in FY05	5 additional Regions	Goal not yet met. Several offices have not yet decided to direct contractors to learn and record their production activities using SDMS workflow.
2006	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Number of Regions accepting and processing electronic records.	2 Regions added in FY05	5 additional Regions	7 of 10 Regions and Headquarters are capturing E-records
2006	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Utilize XML templates for automated ingestion of records.	0 - XML templates have been introduced in Region 6 but they are not heavily used.	50% Use of templates in at least 2 Regions for ROD and 5 Year Review documents.	Goal not yet met. This has become an issue of interest to the Agency as it moves forward on the ECMS project. SDMS is leading the analysis.
2006	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Unique visitors per month (inside firewall)	470 unique visitors accessed the site in FY05.	Additional 75 users on average per month.	Average of 632 unique visitors access the site.
2006	Goal 3: Land	Technology	Information and	Data Reliability	Percentage of	5% of SDMS site	Increase to 50%	Goal not yet

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Superfund Document Management System (SDMS) (Revision 9)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Preservation and Restoration		Data	and Quality	sites in SDMS with SDMS document connections from CERCLIS (or a replacement system that tracks performance against strategic objectives)	records linked to CERCLIS.	of all documents	met. Connections between SDMS and CERCLIS in planning phase. A new system is being planned that will require deeper connections between CERCLIS data and SDMS documents.
2007	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Availability of core and source documents accessible via SDMS for the public, congress and legal entities which will improve emergency response time, and assist in disaster preparedness and planning.	0	25% of core and source docs accessible via the web.	TBD
2007	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	Availability of SDMS prior to, during and after an incident by ensuring that all end users (including ECMS) have 24 hrs/7 day access to documents in SDMS.	250 users for SDMS thru ECMS integration.	500 new users for SDMS thru ECMS integration	TBD
2007	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Management	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	SDMS will be loaded with coastal maps to use during the 2007 Hurricane season	0	2 Regions OSC/OEM team will use SDMS preparedness exercises in 2007	TBD
2007	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Management	Emergency Response	OEM/OSC have real time access to SDMS data via Aventail (AAA extranet)	2 Regions currently have access	3 additional Regions with access - 5 total	TBD
2007	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Utilize XML templates for automated ingestion of electronic records. This process will improve the response time in an emergency by increasing the accuracy of electronic records.	0	50% use of XML templates in 2 Regions for ROD and 5-Year Review documents.	TBD
2007	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Timeliness for accepting and processing electronic records after an incident.	7 Regions	10 (complete compliance) regions accepting and processing electronic records.	TBD
2007	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Ensure effective response to and planning for incidents by providing unique visitors access per month (inside firewall.)	632 unique users were reported in FY 06. 400 unique users were reported in FY 05.	Additional 175 users on average per month.	TBD
2007	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Information and Data	Internal Data Sharing	Response time required in an emergency by increasing the	10% reported in FY 2006	Increase to 50% of all documents	TBD

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Superfund Document Management System (SDMS) (Revision 9)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					amount of data shared between systems. Percentage of sites in SDMS with SDMS document connections from CERCLIS (or a later system that tracks performance against strag. objs.)			
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Availability of core and source documents accessible via SDMS for the public, congress and legal entities which will improve emergency response time, and assist in disaster preparedness and planning.	25% availability of post-1995 Administrative Records and 5 Year Reviews accessible in SDMS.	50% of core and source docs accessible via the web.	TBD
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	Availability of SDMS prior to, during and after an incident by ensuring that all end users (including ECMS) have 24 hrs/7 day access to documents in SDMS.	500 users for SDMS thru ECMS integration.	750 new users for SDMS thru ECMS integration	TBD
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Management	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	SDMS will be loaded with coastal maps to use during the 2008 Hurricane season	2 Regional teams are using. Relying upon viewing coastal maps via SDMS preparedness exercise.	5 Regions OSC/OEM team will use SDMS preparedness exercises in 2008	TBD
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Management	Emergency Response	OEM/OSC have real time access to SDMS data via Avenail (AAA extranet)	5 Regions currently have access	5 additional Regions with access (10 total)	TBD
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Integrate SDMS & CERCLIS to meet the mission critical information requirements for FY08, GPRA and Superfund Program Goals included in Strategic Plan. CERCLIS is the only official tool used to track and report all SF GPRA and SF Perf & Eff. Goals.	0%	50% of GPRA and Superfund Program goals & accomplishments will be retrievable from SDMS/CERCLIS	TBD
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Remediation	Address environmental hazards and contamination by ensuring that the RPM is able to use SDMS portal to access data.	0	5 Regions use SDMS Portal in 2008	TBD
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Utilize XML templates for automated ingestion of electronic records. This process will	50% use of XML templates have been introduced but this has become an issue of interest to the Agency as it	75% use of XML templates in 5 Regions for ROD and 5-Year Review documents.	TBD

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Superfund Document Management System (SDMS) (Revision 9)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					improve the response time in an emergency by increasing the accuracy of electronic records.	moves forward with ECMS.		
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Ensure effective response to and planning for incidents by providing unique visitors access per month (inside firewall.)	See results of FY 2007	Additional 175 users on average per month.	TBD
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Information and Data	Internal Data Sharing	Response time required in an emergency by increasing the amount of data shared between systems. Percentage of sites in SDMS with SDMS document connections from CERCLIS (or a later system that tracks performance against strag. objs.)	See results of FY 2007.	Increase to 75% of all documents	TBD
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Availability of core and source documents accessible via SDMS for the public, congress and legal entities which will improve emergency response time, and assist in disaster preparedness and planning.	50% availability of post-1995 Administrative Records and 5 Year Reviews accessible in SDMS.	75% of core and source docs accessible via the web.	TBD
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	Availability of SDMS prior to, during and after an incident by ensuring that all end users (including ECMS) have 24 hrs/7 day access to documents in SDMS.	750 users for SDMS thru ECMS integration.	1000 new users for SDMS thru ECMS integration	TBD
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Management	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	SDMS will be loaded with coastal maps to use during the 2009 Hurricane season	5 Regional teams should be using. Relying upon viewing coastal maps via SDMS preparedness exercise.	8 Regions OSC/OEM teams will use SDMS preparedness exercises in 2009	TBD
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Management	Emergency Response	OEM/OSC have real time access to SDMS data via Aventail (AAA extranet)	5 Regions should have access	5 additional Regions with access (10 total)	TBD
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Integrate SDMS & CERCLIS to meet the mission critical information requirements for FY09, GPRA and Superfund Program Goals included in Strategic Plan. CERCLIS is the only official tool	50%	100% of GPRA and Superfund Program goals & accomplishments will be retrievable from SDMS/CERCLIS	TBD

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					used to track and report all SF GPRA and SF Perf & Eff. Goals.			
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Remediation	Address environmental hazards and contamination by ensuring that the RPM is able to use SDMS portal to access data.	5 Regions	All Regions use SDMS Portal in 2009	TBD
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Utilize XML templates for automated ingestion of electronic records. This process will improve the response time in an emergency by increasing the accuracy of electronic records.	75% use of XML templates have been introduced but this has become an issue of interest to the Agency as it moves forward with ECMS.	75% use of XML templates in 7 Regions for ROD and 5-Year Review documents.	TBD
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Ensure effective response to and planning for incidents by providing unique visitors access per month (inside firewall.)	See results of FY 2008	additional 175 users on average per month.	TBD
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Information and Data	Internal Data Sharing	Response time required in an emergency by increasing the amount of data shared between systems. Percentage of sites in SDMS with SDMS document connections from CERCLIS (or a later system that tracks performance against strag. objs.)	See results of FY 2008.	Increase to 90% of all documents	TBD

**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)
Superfund Document Management System	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
Superfund Document Management System	Government Only	Moderate	Yes	1/27/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/20/2006	8/31/2007

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? No

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition 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. Superfund Document Management System (SDMS)

b. If "no," please explain why?

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

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

**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)
SDMS Metadata Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support the maintenance and administration of data that describes data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Meta Data Management			No Reuse	9
SDMS Reporting	SDMS reports	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	2
SDMS Reporting	SDMS reports	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	2
Configuration Management	Process and tools for software version and release management	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Configuration Management	Configuration Management	020-00-01-16-04-0240-24	Internal	2
SDMS Life Cycle Management	SDMS Life Cycle Management	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Quality Management			No Reuse	4
SDMS Portal	Integration with EPA Portal	Digital Asset Services	Content Management	Content Publishing and Delivery	Content Publishing and Delivery	020-00-01-16-02-6029-00	Internal	4
Workflow Services	Documentum Workflow Manager, ExpressLink, Business Process Manager	Digital Asset Services	Content Management	Content Review and Approval	Content Review and Approval	020-00-01-16-04-0240-24	Internal	1
SDMS Content Capture	Defines the subset of capability for conversion of document formats	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Conversion			No Reuse	2
Scanning Services	Kofax Ascent Capture	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Imaging and OCR			No Reuse	4
Document Management Services	Cross referencing of documents using Documentum	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Referencing	Document Referencing	020-00-01-16-04-0240-24	Internal	6
SDMS Content Capture	Defines the set of capabilities that facilitate collection of data.	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Indexing			No Reuse	6
SDMS Search and Retrieval	Defines the set of capabilities that support indexing for search and retrieval	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Indexing			No Reuse	4

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Superfund Document Management System (SDMS) (Revision 9)

<b>4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:</b> 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)
ECMS Repository Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support document and data warehousing and archiving.	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Library / Storage	Library / Storage	020-00-01-16-04-0240-24	Internal	9
Document Management Services	Documentum virtual document, SDMS Collections, SDMS Central Registry	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Mapping / Taxonomy	Information Mapping / Taxonomy	020-00-01-16-04-0240-24	Internal	4
SDMS Search and Retrieval	Defines the set of capabilities that support selection and retrieval of records organized by shared characteristics in content or context.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	9
SDMS Content Sharing	Defines the capabilities to share SDMS data across the ECMS, ICTS, CERCLIS Platforms and CD-ROM media.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing	Information Sharing	020-00-01-16-01-6029-00	Internal	9
Workflow Services	Documentum Workflow Manager, ExpressLink, Business Process Manager	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture	Knowledge Capture	020-00-01-16-04-0240-24	Internal	2
SDMS Portal	Provide access to the SDMS documents	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	020-00-01-16-01-6006-00	Internal	1
ECMS Records Management	Defines the set of capabilities that allow classification of data and information into specific layers or types to support an organization.	Digital Asset Services	Records Management	Document Classification	Document Classification	020-00-01-16-04-0240-24	Internal	6
Records Management Services	Records Manager, SDMS (standard) File Plan, Agency-wide File Plan, Records Manager/Retention Policy Services	Digital Asset Services	Records Management	Record Linking / Association	Record Linking / Association	020-00-01-16-04-0240-24	Internal	4
Portal Collaboration	Workspaces, Content Services, Discussion Services, Calendar Services	Support Services	Collaboration	Threaded Discussions	Threaded Discussions	020-00-01-16-01-6006-00	Internal	1
SDMS Identity and Access Management	Provide Authorization, Authentication and ID Provisioning Services to SDMS.	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication	Identification and Authentication	020-00-01-16-02-6006-00	Internal	6

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.

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Superfund Document Management System (SDMS) (Revision 9)

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

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

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

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

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Document Classification	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	
Meta Data Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	
Document Referencing	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	
Content Review and Approval	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Library / Storage	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Threaded Discussions	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Library / Storage	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Library / Storage	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	
Document Conversion	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	
Record Linking / Association	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Portal Servers	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Peripherals	

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Superfund Document Management System (SDMS) (Revision 9)

<b>5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:</b>				
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.				
<b>FEA SRM Component (a)</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)</b>
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Peripherals	
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)	
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Quality Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	
Information Mapping / Taxonomy	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Indexing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	

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.

SDMS is creating an agreement with the Federal Dockets Management System for publishing from SDMS site Administrative Records, which are essential and often voluminous collections of decision documents.

**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?      8/30/2006
  - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
  - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results: <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
Alternative 1-Integrated Solution--SEMS			
Alternative 2-Centralized Solution			
Alternative 3-Customized Solution			
Alternative 4-Status Quo			

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

The integration of the three existing core Superfund Management Systems (SMS)--namely SDMS, CERCLIS and ICTS--into a single Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) was the alternative chosen to close the performance gap for capturing, preserving and disseminating legislatively mandated Superfund documents and records. The CERCLIS and ICTS legacy system business cases are covered in a separate Exhibit 300 and in a CPIC Lite, respectively. The projected disposition dates of these systems is listed in the table below. The proposed SEMS is consistent with EPA EA strategies of reusing existing components and capabilities. It reduces redundancies by having a single project management team responsible for one large investment and having a single Certified and Accredited system instead of multiple systems. It is the least cost alternative and it yields the same benefits as customizing a new system with much reduced risk and a shorter implementation time. The SEMS alternative leverages proven in-use applications.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

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

**Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)**

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?      Yes
  - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?      6/1/2006
  - 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 is currently 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? 8/6/2007

## 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			
1	SDMS2: Conduct Formal Risk Assessment of OSRTI (Local) Configuration	11/15/2005	\$0.05	11/15/2005	11/30/2005	\$0.05	\$0.05	-15	\$0	100%
2	SDMS2: Alternatives Analysis for Establishment of Centralized Repository (= SDMS2 Contingency Configuration)	11/15/2005	\$0.015	11/15/2005	11/23/2005	\$0.015	\$0.007	-8	\$0.008	100%
3	SDMS2: Cost - Benefit Analysis for Selected Centralized Repository Alternative	1/15/2006	\$0.025	1/15/2006	2/17/2006	\$0.025	\$0.015	-33	\$0.01	100%
4	SDMS2: Update Risk Management Plan to Include Central Repository	2/15/2006	\$0.01	2/15/2006	11/27/2006	\$0.01	\$0.006	-285	\$0.004	100%
5	SDMS2: Central Repository Implementation of ExpressLink	1/31/2006	\$0.07	1/31/2006		\$0.07	\$0.025		\$0.0366	88%
6	SDMS2: Implement Central Repository (=Activation of SDMS2 Contingency	9/30/2006	\$0.1	9/30/2006		\$0.1	\$0.438		\$-0.347	91%

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			
	Plan; Fully Operational When All Regional Datasets are Migrated and Synchronized in Central Repository									
7	SDMS2: Conduct Risk Assessment of Central Repository with Test Instance of OSRTI Content	3/31/2006	\$0.05	3/31/2006	11/30/2005	\$0.05	\$0.05	121	\$0	100%
8	SDMS2: Integrate Documentum's Records Management Functionalities with SDMS2	7/31/2006	\$0.265	7/31/2006		\$0.265	\$0.133		\$0.07635	79%
9	SDMS2: Create Central Registry Application	6/1/2006	\$0.27	6/1/2006		\$0.27	\$0.253		\$0.0116	98%
10	SDMS2: Sequencing Plan for Migration / Replication of Regional Content to Central Repository	4/15/2006	\$0.008	4/15/2006	3/31/2006	\$0.008	\$0	15	\$0.008	100%
11	SDMS2: Migrate Localized Oracle Databases Instances to Central	9/29/2006	\$0.075	9/29/2006		\$0.075	\$0.014		\$0.046	80%

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			
	Database									
12	SDMS2: Management Evaluation Report of Regional SDMS Systems Uses and Dependencies in Preparation for Content Migration / Replication to Central Repository	3/31/2006	\$0.038	3/31/2006	3/31/2006	\$0.038	\$0.021	0	\$0.017	100%
13	SDMS2: Migrate / Replicate Regional SDMS Content to Central Repository	2/15/2007	\$0.1	2/15/2007		\$0.1	\$0.007		\$0.054	61%
14	SDMS2: Security Plan Update	5/31/2006	\$0.025	5/31/2006	4/10/2006	\$0.025	\$0.01	51	\$0.015	100%
15	SDMS3: Map Regional Business Processes and Workflows	8/31/2006	\$0.025	8/31/2006		\$0.025	\$0.017		\$0.008	100%
16	Review PDF-A[rchive] Format as Potential Central Repository Migration Target Format	4/28/2006	\$0.01	4/28/2006	10/30/2006	\$0.01	\$0	-185	\$0.01	100%
17	SDMS3: Cost - Benefit Analysis	3/31/2006	\$0.012	3/31/2006	8/24/2006	\$0.012	\$0.008	-146	\$0.004	100%

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			
18	SDMS3: Draft System Architecture	4/30/2006	\$0.1	4/30/2006	2/6/2006	\$0.1	\$0.002	83	\$0.098	100%
19	SDMS3: Draft Disaster Recovery Plan	5/31/2006	\$0.005	5/31/2006	3/31/2006	\$0.005	\$0.001	61	\$0.004	100%
20	Update Privacy Impact Assessment (FY06)	6/15/2006	\$0.001	6/15/2006	6/12/2006	\$0.001	\$0	3	\$0.001	100%
21	Develop an inventory of current sources and contractual obligations for information security products and services	12/31/2005	\$0.002	12/31/2005	1/15/2006	\$0.002	\$0.001	-15	\$0.001	100%
22	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	\$0	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	100%
23	Implement plan to migrate from current information security	9/30/2007	\$0	9/30/2007		\$0	\$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			
	acquisition processes to the procurement of information security products and services from Centers of Excellence established under the Information Systems Security Line of Business									
24	Operations & Maintenance (FY06)	9/30/2006	\$0.95	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0.95	\$2.188	0	\$-1.238	100%
25	Security (FY06)	9/30/2006	\$0.15	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0.15	\$0.066	0	\$0.084	100%
26	Working Capital Fund (FY06)	9/30/2006	\$1	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$1	\$0.181	0	\$0.819	100%
27	Update Privacy Impact Assessment (FY07)	6/30/2007	\$0.003	6/30/2007		\$0.003				0%
28	SDMS2: Central Repository Implementation of ExpressLink (FY07)	9/30/2007	\$0.045	9/30/2007		\$0.045	\$0.008		\$0.028	80%
29	SDMS2: Implement Central Repository (=Activation of SDMS2 Contingency Plan; Fully	9/30/2007	\$0.15	9/30/2007		\$0.15	\$0.195		\$-0.0735	81%

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 'O' 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			
	Operational When All Regional Datasets are Migrated and Synchronized in Central Repository (FY07)									
30	SDMS2: Integrate Documentum's Records Management Functionalities with SDMS2 (FY07)	9/30/2007	\$0.225	9/30/2007		\$0.225	\$0.117		\$0.01125	57%
31	SDMS2: Create Central Registry Application (FY07)	9/30/2007	\$0.145	9/30/2007		\$0.145	\$0.097		\$-0.0042	64%
32	SDMS2: Migrate Localized Oracle Databases Instances to Central Database (FY07)	9/30/2007	\$0.09	9/30/2007		\$0.09	\$0.003		\$0.069	80%
33	SDMS2: Migrate / Replicate Regional SDMS Content to Central Repository (FY07)	9/30/2007	\$0.02	9/30/2007		\$0.02				80%
34	Incorporate Agency IT Enterprise	9/30/2008	\$0.008	9/30/2008		\$0.008	\$0.01		\$-0.00912	11%

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			
	Architecture Plan Into SDMS Development Path: Select Components to Add, such as Identity and Access Management									
35	Implement plan to migrate from current information security acquisition processes to the procurement of information security products and services from Centers of Excellence established under the Information Systems Security Line of Business	9/30/2008	\$0	9/30/2008		\$0				0%
36	Operations & Maintenance (FY07)	9/30/2007	\$3.397	9/30/2007		\$3.397	\$0.971		\$-0.05381	27%
37	Security (FY 07)	9/30/2007	\$0.241	9/30/2007		\$0.241	\$0.026		\$0.00051	11%
38	Implement plan to migrate from current information security	9/30/2008	\$0	9/30/2009		\$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			
	acquisition processes to the procurement of information security products and services from Centers of Excellence established under the Information Systems Security Line of Business									
40	Government FTE (FY07)	9/30/2007	\$0.3	9/30/2007		\$0.3	\$0.15		\$0	50%
41	Integration of SDMS/ICTS (FY08)	2/29/2008	\$0.67	2/29/2008		\$0.67				0%
42	Integration of SDMS/EPA Portal (FY08)	12/28/2007	\$0.3	12/28/2007		\$0.3				0%
43	Operations & Maintenance (FY08)	9/30/2008	\$2.1	9/30/2008		\$2.1				0%
44	Security (FY08)	9/30/2008	\$0.28	9/30/2008		\$0.28				0%
45	Government FTE (FY08)	9/30/2008	\$0.2	9/30/2008		\$0.2				0%
46	Core System Documentation Update (FY09)	9/30/2009	\$0.15	9/30/2009		\$0.15				0%
47	Operations & Maintenance (FY09)	9/30/2009	\$1.7	9/30/2009		\$1.7				0%
48	Security (FY09)	9/30/2009	\$0.085	9/30/2009		\$0.085				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			
49	Government FTE (FY09)	9/30/2009	\$0.22	9/30/2009		\$0.22				0%
54	O&M (FY2005 & Prior Costs)	9/30/2005	\$37.21	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$37.21	\$37.21	0	\$0	100%
55	Government FTE (FY06 & prior)	9/30/2006	\$2.51	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$2.51	\$2.51	0	\$0	100%
<b>Project Totals</b>										