

**Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary**

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

**Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)**

1. Date of Submission: 4/10/2009
2. Agency: Environmental Protection Agency
3. Bureau: Office Of Solid Waste And Emergency Response
4. Name of this Capital Asset: BY2010 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 020-00-01-13-01-1010-00

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Operations and Maintenance

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:

CERCLIS addresses the Superfund Program performance gap to provide and disseminate an "official record" of EPA hazardous waste site assessment and remediation activities to federal, state, local and tribal governments as well as citizens in furtherance of protecting human health and the environment and of Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration. CERCLIS supports the collection and dissemination of information mandated by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) as amended in 1986 and core mission Goals and Objectives (Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration, Objective 3.2: Restore Land) by providing an electronic method of reporting achievements, GPRA goals and objectives for restoring land, and program strategic and performance targets defined in the Superfund Program Implementation Manual. The joint development and ongoing collaboration between Superfund's Remedial, Removal, Federal Facilities (FF), Enforcement, and Emergency Response programs gives managers the ability to plan, manage, track-for-evaluation, and report on clean-up and enforcement activities at Superfund and FF sites. This closes the Superfund performance gap of site activity tracking and reporting. User and stakeholder meetings are held regularly to address operation and maintenance concerns, and maintenance schedules and milestones are developed for their resolution. Performance Indicators are included demonstrating the use of Technology to ensure quality and effectiveness, Processes for Security, Mission and Business results in Environmental Management and Customer Results in Service Accessibility in delivering results.

CERCLIS was scheduled to be replaced with Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS). The FY2009 business case indicated its phasing out in 2010. The integration of three existing core Superfund Management Systems (CERCLIS-CPIC, ICTS-CPIC Lite and SDMS-CPIC) into a single SEMS was chosen to close the performance gap for capturing, preserving and disseminating legislatively mandated Superfund documents and records. SEMS supports EA strategies of reusing existing components and capabilities and reduces redundancies by having a single project management team for one large investment.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
- a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 8/28/2008

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes

11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?

Name

Phone Number

Email

a. What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the program/project manager?

b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned?

c. What date did the Program/Project Manager receive the

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System  
(CERCLIS) (Revision 12)

FAC-P/PM certification? If the certification has not been issued, what is the anticipated date for certification?

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? Yes

a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? Yes

b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) No

1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?

2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?

3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?

13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? Yes

If "yes," check all that apply: Expanded E-Government

a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?) CERCLIS provides expanded access to the public and government for information for citizen and government decision makers. CERCLIS feeds data directly to the EPA's Public Superfund Website, providing the public the latest clean-up progress & technologies in use at the Superfund sites. EPA conducts Citizen Forums & National Focus Groups to determine what data to display to best meet the needs of stakeholders demonstrating Customer Results to Goal3: Land Preservation and Restoration.

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? 10002292 - Superfund Remedial Action

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. In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) No

19. Is this a financial management system? No

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

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

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

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

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

Hardware

5

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System  
(CERCLIS) (Revision 12)

Software 5  
 Services 90  
 Other 0

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:

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

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? No

**Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)**

1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The "TOTAL" estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	5.32	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	22.154	0	0	0					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	27.474	0	0	0					
Operations & Maintenance:	41.795	2.855	2.83	2.83					
TOTAL:	69.269	2.855	2.83	2.83					
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	3.25	0.269	0.263	0.284					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	14	2	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 FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

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

1. Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) (Revision 12)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA 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)
68-W-04-005, Task 019	Performance , performance fee	Yes	1/1/2004	5/2/2005	9/30/2007	6.000	No	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes				
68-W-04-005	Cost Plus Incentive Fee	Yes	9/30/2007	11/1/2007	9/30/2011	9.450	No	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes				

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

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done? The ITS-ESE contract requires that the EPA Web Development Guide be adhered to for all web development tasks. The contractor utilizes tools that verify Section 508 compliance and the EPA Office of Public Affairs (OPA) verifies and approves of all public facing web sites and applications. Additionally, 508 compliance for the general system is part of the IT development Task Order itself.

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

a. If "yes," what is the date? 7/23/2008

1. Is it Current?

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 the next President's Budget.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	The availability of CERCLIS to end users for data entry and retrieval of program / site data. Availability is measured as an indicator of the number days in percent of yrly op days when 313 days is 100% availability.	100% or 313 days	95% or 297 days	Results to be reported 9/30/2008
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	The number of sites with final RODs entered into CERCLIS with a corresponding SDMS number. As an environmental indicator of the successful management and clean-up at sites.	95%	35	50% complete as of 6/30/2008
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Compliance	The percent of Superfund GPRA and program EOY	100%	100%	Results to be reported 9/30/2008

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS)  
(Revision 12)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					accomplishments tracked in CERCLIS. As an indicator of successful management and reporting for the FY as well as compliance monitoring activities with agreements to clean up sites.			
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	The number of reports converted from Discover to Infomaker. As an indicator of changing program reporting priorities and ease of report accessibility to the end users.	75%	160	Results to be reported 9/30/2008
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	The daily availability of CERCLIS to end users for data entry and retrieval of program tracking data as reported by server statistics. Availability is measured in percent of yrly op days when 313 is 100% availability.	100%	100%	Results to be reported 9/30/2009
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Percent of Lat/Long locations accurately reported within the system for all NPL sites resolved within 30 days of identification. As an indicator of improving Lat/Long data in CERCLIS, to be monitored monthly.	100%	12 - 15	Results to be reported 9/30/2009
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	The total number of System Audit Logs delivered by the 7th working day of each month to assure monitoring of system access by regional system administrators.	100%	12	Results to be reported 9/30/2009
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	Number of users responding to the customer satisfaction survey distributed by the Superfund Reporting Center with positive feedback. As an indicator that the CERCLIS system provides	80%	80%	Results to be reported 9/30/2009

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS)  
(Revision 12)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					correct, accurate and consistent information for Superfund sites.			
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Quality Assurance	Standards Compliance and Deviations	The number of annual data quality enhancements reports introduced in the system. As a program indicator of monitoring the quality of site data with compliance monitoring activity at sites.	3 per year	3 per year	Results to be reported 9/30/2009
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	The daily availability of CERCLIS to end users for data entry and retrieval of program tracking data as reported by server statistics. Availability is measured in percent of yrly op days when 313 is 100% availability.	100%	100%	Results to be reported 9/30/2010
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Percent of Lat/Long locations accurately reported within the system for all NPL sites resolved within 30 days of identification. As an indicator of improving Lat/Long data in CERCLIS, to be monitored monthly.	100%	12 - 15	Results to be reported 9/30/2010
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	The total number of System Audit Logs delivered by the 7th working day of each month to assure monitoring of system access by regional system administrators.	100%	12	Results to be reported 9/30/2010
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	Number of users responding to the customer satisfaction survey distributed by the Superfund Reporting Center with positive feedback. As an indicator that the CERCLIS system provides correct, accurate and consistent information for Superfund sites.	80%	80%	Results to be reported 9/30/2010
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Quality Assurance	Standards Compliance and Deviations	The number of annual data quality	3 per year	3 per year	Results to be reported 9/30/2010

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					enhancements reports introduced in the system. As a program indicator of monitoring the quality of site data with compliance monitoring activity at sites.			

**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)

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS)  
(Revision 12)

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A)	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
CERCLIS	Contractor and Government	Moderate	yes	7/3/2007	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/27/2007	7/16/2008

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
CERCLIS	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII on members of the public. Therefore, a PIA is not 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? No

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

b. If "no," please explain why?

CERCLIS is not included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy because it does not meet the criteria for inclusion as set by the Chief Architect. CERCLIS does not have money going toward DME, which is required for an investment to be included. CERCLIS is considered a Legacy System and would be cost prohibited to develop and move into the target architecture when it is scheduled to be retired in 2012. The next generation of CERCLIS system will follow all the current Chief architecture guidelines.

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

a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the 325-000

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS)  
(Revision 12)

agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>.

**4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:**  
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
CERCLIS Import/Export Snapshot Processes	Defines the set of capabilities that support the interchange of information between multiple systems or applications.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	5
CERCLIS Superfund Reporting Center	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of dynamic reports on an as needed basis.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	10
CERCLIS ReportLink Reporting Architecture	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of pre-conceived or pre-written reports.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	20
CERCLIS Change Management	Control the process for updates or modifications to the existing documents, software, or business processes of an organization	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Change Management			No Reuse	10
CERCLIS Configuration Management	Control the hardware and software environment, as well as documents of an organization	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Configuration Management			No Reuse	10
CERCLIS Project Management	Manage and control a particular effort of an organization	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management			No Reuse	9
CERCLIS Requirements Management	Gather, analyze, and fulfill the needs and prerequisites of an organization's efforts	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Requirements Management			No Reuse	5
CERCLIS C-Pad Extract/OSRTI Worknet Internet and Intranet Applications	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of documents and data in a multi-user environment for use by an organization and its stakeholders.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval	Information Sharing	020-00-01-13-02-3002-00	Internal	3
CERCLIS C-Pad Web Extract/OSRTI Worknet Internet and Intranet Applications.	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of documents and data in a multi-user environment for use by an organization and its stakeholders.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing	Information Retrieval	020-00-01-13-02-3002-00	Internal	7
CERCLIS System Administration	Support the management of	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	5

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS)  
(Revision 12)

<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)
	permissions for logging onto a computer, application, service, or network: includes user management and role/privilege management.							
CERCLIS Access Audit	Support the identification and monitoring of activities within an application, system, or network.	Support Services	Security Management	Audit Trail Capture and Analysis			No Reuse	3
CERCLIS User Identification Authentication	Support obtaining information about those parties attempting to log on to a system or application for security purposes and the validation of those users.	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	5
CERCLIS Intrusion Detection	Includes penetration detection testing and other measures to detect unauthorized access to a government information system.	Support Services	Security Management	Intrusion Detection			No Reuse	3
CERCLIS Project Management	Manage and control a particular effort of an organization.	Support Services	Systems Management	Issue Tracking			No Reuse	5

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

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

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

d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the 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%.

<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.				
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)
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Configuration Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS)  
(Revision 12)

<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>
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Intrusion Detection	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Access Control	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Access Control	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Configuration Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Configuration Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Requirements Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Configuration Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Change Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Change Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Issue Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Requirements Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Change Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Change Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	
Change Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	
Change Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	
Program / Project Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent Technologies	
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent Technologies	

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., USA.gov, Pay.Gov, etc)? No

a. If "yes," please describe.

**Exhibit 300: Part III: For "Operation and Maintenance" investments ONLY (Steady State)**

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

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes  
a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 5/30/2007  
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?

**Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)**

1. Was an operational analysis conducted? Yes  
a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed. 4/20/2007  
b. If "yes," what were the results?

CERCLIS is currently not required to use EVM management. However, the CERCLIS operations and maintenance support contractor, Lockheed Martin, operating under EPA's Systems Engineering Support Contract (ITS-ESE 68W-04-005) tracks monthly delivery order cost and milestones at the Task and Subtask level. This practice allows the CERCLIS team to monitor project health and rate performance against projected cost and schedule. This also allows CERCLIS to integrate requirements/scope, schedule, and cost objectives and establish baseline plans for accomplishing program objectives and measuring program execution.

This form of operational analysis is performed monthly during the CERCLIS Change Control Board Meeting (CCB) where the Project Manager, together with the CERCLIS Project Team examines the monthly metrics to ensure that CERCLIS is meeting program objectives and performing within its cost and schedule baseline. Any corrective action or technical direction issued by the Project Manager is recorded and made a formal part of the Task record and supplied to the EPA contracting officer. Currently this systematic review is done manually using a combination of Microsoft Project and Excel. The process is, nevertheless, both formal and documented.

Quarterly, CERCLIS reports Operational Analysis metrics to the Agency for review. This process is in accordance with the Agency's Operational Analysis Guidance issued April 21, 2006. These metrics are reviewed by the Agency's Information Investment Subcommittee (IIS). Based on Operational Analysis Metrics, CERCLIS is meeting its performance goals by delivering customer service and providing updates as required to meet changing requirements, and continues to stay on budget.

- c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:

2. Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts).

- a. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? Contractor and Government

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) (Revision 12)

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
2006	FY 2006 CERCLIS (Cumulative since inception)	9/30/2006	\$69.059000	9/30/2006	\$69.059000	0	\$0.000000
2006.1	FY 2006 Prior Planning (Cumulative Since Inception)	9/30/2006	\$5.320000	9/30/2006	\$5.320000	0	\$0.000000
2006.2	FY 2006 Prior Acquisition (Cumulative Since Inception)	9/30/2006	\$22.154000	9/30/2006	\$22.154000	0	\$0.000000
2006.3	FY 2006 Prior Operations and Maintenance (Cumulative Since Inception)	9/30/2006	\$38.675000	9/30/2006	\$38.675000	0	\$0.000000
2006.4	FY 2006 Prior Government FTE (Cumulative Since Inception)	9/30/2006	\$2.910000	9/30/2006	\$2.910000	0	\$0.000000
2007	FY 2007 CERCLIS	9/30/2007	\$3.460000	9/30/2007	\$3.876000	0	-\$0.416000
071	Operations and Maintenance	9/30/2007	\$1.070000	9/30/2007	\$1.501000	0	-\$0.431000
071.1	Document Data Base	9/30/2007	\$0.050000	9/30/2007	\$0.050000	0	\$0.000000
071.2	User Request System	9/30/2007	\$0.040000	9/30/2007	\$0.040000	0	\$0.000000
071.3	Citrix Interface	9/30/2007	\$0.300000	9/30/2007	\$0.300000	0	\$0.000000
071.4	Configuration Management	9/30/2007	\$0.150000	9/30/2007	\$0.150000	0	\$0.000000
071.5	Documentation Updates	9/30/2007	\$0.040000	9/30/2007	\$0.040000	0	\$0.000000
071.6	ReportLink System	9/30/2007	\$0.200000	9/30/2007	\$0.200000	0	\$0.000000
071.7	Data Management	9/30/2007	\$0.290000	9/30/2007	\$0.721000	0	-\$0.431000
072	Security	9/30/2007	\$0.600000	9/30/2007	\$0.600000	0	\$0.000000
073	CERCLIS Release 3.19.2	7/1/2007	\$0.300000	7/1/2007	\$0.320000	0	-\$0.020000
074	Risk Remediation	9/30/2007	\$0.150000	9/30/2007	\$0.145000	0	\$0.005000
075	NCC Support	9/30/2007	\$0.300000	9/30/2007	\$0.300000	0	\$0.000000
076	Government FTE	9/30/2007	\$0.340000	9/30/2007	\$0.340000	0	\$0.000000
077	CERCLIS Training	9/30/2007	\$0.030000	9/30/2007	\$0.010000	0	\$0.020000
078	CERCLIS Help Desk	9/30/2007	\$0.280000	9/30/2007	\$0.270000	0	\$0.010000
079	CERCLIS Consolidation	9/30/2007	\$0.390000	9/30/2007	\$0.390000	0	\$0.000000
2008	FY 2008 CERCLIS	9/30/2008	\$3.150000				
081	Operations and Maintenance	9/30/2008	\$1.300000				
081.1	Document Data Base	9/30/2008	\$0.050000				
081.2	User Request System	9/30/2008	\$0.100000				
081.3	Citrix Interface	9/30/2008	\$0.375000				

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
081.4	Configuration Management	9/30/2008	\$0.300000				
081.5	Documentation Updates	9/30/2008	\$0.035000				
081.6	ReportLink System	9/30/2008	\$0.150000				
081.7	Data Management	9/30/2008	\$0.290000				
082	Security	9/30/2008	\$0.500000				
083	CERCLIS Release 3.22	9/30/2008	\$0.250000				
084	Risk Remediation	9/30/2008	\$0.100000				
085	NCC Support	9/30/2008	\$0.300000				
086	Government FTE	9/30/2008	\$0.350000				
087	Develop Sys Retirement Plan, including data migration, system archival, disposition of hardware and software	9/30/2008	\$0.050000				
088	CERCLIS Training	9/30/2008	\$0.025000				
089	CERCLIS Help Desk	9/30/2008	\$0.275000				
2009	FY 2009 CERCLIS	9/30/2009	\$3.150000				
091	Operations and Maintenance	9/30/2009	\$1.400000				
092	Security	7/31/2009	\$0.160000				
093	CERCLIS Release 3.22	9/30/2009	\$0.215000				
094	Risk Remediation	9/30/2009	\$0.100000				
095	NCC Support	9/30/2009	\$0.330000				
096	Government FTE	9/30/2009	\$0.320000				
097	CERCLIS Release 3.23	9/30/2009	\$0.250000				
098	ReportLink System Release	9/30/2009	\$0.100000				
099	CERCLIS Help Desk	9/30/2009	\$0.275000				
2010	FY 2010 CERCLIS	9/30/2010	\$3.150000				
101	Operations and Maintenance	9/30/2010	\$1.370000				
102	Security	9/30/2010	\$0.150000				
104	Risk Remediation	9/30/2010	\$0.100000				
105	ReportLink System Release	9/30/2010	\$0.100000				

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
106	NCC Support	9/30/2010	\$0.330000				
107	Government FTE	9/30/2010	\$0.320000				
108	CERCLIS Training	9/30/2010	\$0.025000				
109	CERCLIS Help Desk	9/30/2010	\$0.275000				
1010	CERCLIS Release 3.23	9/30/2009	\$0.215000				
1011	CERCLIS Release 3.24	9/30/2009	\$0.265000				
<b>Project Totals</b>				<b>9/30/2007</b>	<b>\$72.935000</b>	<b>1461</b>	<b>\$12.184000</b>