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 The Chief Financial Officer
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	Preliminary BY2011 Financial Replacement System (FinRS)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	020-00-01-01-01-1126-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in 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.)	Mixed Life Cycle
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2002

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

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

Since the FinRS inception in 2002, EPA has accomplished several milestones in modernizing its financial systems including migrating its payroll systems to DFAS under ePayroll, and constructing an administrative data warehouse (ADW) to manage data and ensure financial data integrity. EPA is currently migrating its travel services to GovTrip under eTravel. In FY07, in alignment with OMB's FMLoB, EPA issued an award to a Shared Service Provider (SSP) to manage and host the Financial System Modernization Project (FSMP), the Agency's new core financial system (the largest FinRS component). The award was protested and EPA resolved the protest in April 2008. Based on the Integrated Baseline Reviews (IBRs) completed in June 2008, EPA will replace its legacy core financial system in October 2010. In addition, EPA will replace the Superfund Cost Recovery Package and Image On-line System (SCORPIOS) in October 2013.

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

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

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 Financial Performance
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?)	Expanded E-Gov: FinRS supports the FMLoB, eTravel, and Budget Formulation and Execution LoB (BFELoB). Progress for these intitiatives can be found on the following documents: E-Gov Scorecard/Milestone Workbook/Proud to Be documents. Financial Performance: EPA continues to integrate financial and contracts information to enhance system capabilities and reporting platforms. Progress is monitored and reported in the Agency's Green Plan.
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.)	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. 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)	Yes
19. Is this a financial management system?	Yes
a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	Yes
1. If "yes," which compliance area:	1. Compliance with Federal accounting standards (e.g. FASAB #4); 2. Compliance with Federal financial management system requirements; 3. Compliance with the US Standard General Ledger (US SGL) at the transaction level
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

FDW - Financial Data Warehouse

ORBIT - OCFO's Reporting and Business Intelligence Tool
PPL - Payroll Personnel and Labor (PeoplePlus)
TM - Travel Manager

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

Hardware	1
Software	6
Services	93
Other	

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

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

Name

Phone Number

Title

E-mail

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	No

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:	9.216	3.351	0	0					
Acquisition:	12.503	1.835	36.451	19.025					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	21.719	5.186	36.451	19.025					
Operations & Maintenance:	29.349	4.082	5.85	5.883					
TOTAL:	51.068	9.268	42.301	24.908					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	16.956	4.156	3.663	3.843					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	159	28	26	26					

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:

The Operations and Maintenance cost for FY 2009 decreased from last year's Exhibit 300 by $1,850K due to the transfer of the Budget Automation System (BAS) to the Legacy Financial Systems (LFS) business case (020-00-01-01-01-1060-00). Since the scope of the core financial system replacement contract replaces the operations and functions performed by BAS, EPA moved the BAS system (part of the Planning system component) to the LFS business case.

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

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.

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)
EP-W-05-023, TaskOrder 0012 (Total value of contract is $128M. Total ceiling value of task order is .717M)	CPAF/IDIQ	Yes	4/15/2005	7/1/2007	4/14/2010	0.717	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes				
GS-33F-N0018, Task Order 1100 (GSA E-Travel)	FFP/IDIQ	Yes	12/16/2004	12/20/2004	11/11/2008	1.04	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes				
EP07H000505 8(a) sole source	Task Order/Labor Hours/ PBSC	Yes	12/20/2006	1/1/2007	12/31/2009	3.458	No	Yes	No	NA	No	Yes				
GS09K99BHD0002, Task Order 15	TM/IDIQ	Yes	7/20/2006	8/22/2006	7/12/2012	4.146	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes				
TBD - ITS-BISS Task Order 107 (Total value of contract is $128m, Total ceiling value of task order is 0.9M)	CPAF/IDIQ	No														
EP-W-07-024 541512	FFP/TM	Yes	2/12/2007	2/12/2007	2/11/2017	83.108	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes				

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)
GS35F4984H Task Order 0015 (541511)	TM	Yes	2/13/2008	2/18/2008	12/31/2012	4.344	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes				
GS35F0306J, BPA 03-OCFOIFMS-01	FFP/TM	Yes	9/22/2003	9/22/2003	9/30/2008	8.8	No	Yes	Yes	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:

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

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

All other FinRS contracts require EVM.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?	Yes
a. Explain why not or how this is being done?	All contracts and task orders satisfy 508 Electronic and Information Technology (E&IT) through the use of assistive technology. This includes the use of hardware or software to assist individuals with disabilities. For example: Blind/low vision solutions include screen readers/magnifiers such as "Big Shot", "ZoomText", "Jaws" and/or "WindowEyes". Deaf/Hard of Hearing solutions include: TTY, Sign Language Interpreters, Assistive Speech Devices such as Speech Amplifiers, or artificial Larynxes.
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?	11/21/2005
1. Is it Current?	Yes
b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?	
1. If "no," briefly explain why:	

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond 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	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of respondents' rating system usability Satisfactory or better (after Product Acceptance Test)	55 %	60%	Available 12/2008
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Accounting	Maintain Percent annual audit opinion by external auditors indicating Excellence in Management Practices relating to Financial	100%	100%	Available 12/2008

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					Management			
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Efficiency	Average time elapsed between opening and closing a trouble ticket	1.5 Hours	1.4 Hours	.875 Hours as of March 31, 2008
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Maintain Percent Availability of IFMS during core working hours	99%	99%	100 % As of March 31, 2008
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of respondents rating system usability Satisfactory or better (after Business Process Re-engineering)	60 %	65%	Available 12/2009
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Accounting	Maintain Percent annual audit opinion by external auditors indicating Excellence in Management Practices relating to Financial Management	100%	100%	Available 12/2009
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Efficiency	Average time elapsed between opening and closing a trouble ticket	1.4 Hours	1.3 Hours	Available 12/2009
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Maintain Percent Availability of IFMS during core working hours	99%	99%	Available 12/2009
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of respondents' rating system usability Satisfactory or better (after User Acceptance Test)	65%	70%	Available 12/2010
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Accounting	Maintain Percent annual audit opinion by external auditors indicating Excellence in Management Practices relating to Financial Management	100%	100%	Available 12/2010
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Efficiency	Average time elapsed between opening and closing a trouble ticket	1.3 Hours	1.2 Hours	Available 12/2010
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Maintain Percent Availability of IFMS during core working hours	99%	99%	Available 12/2010

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: 6

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)
Cost Recovery and Imaging	Contractor and Government		
Financial System Modernization Project	Contractor Only		

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A)	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Administrative Data Warehouse/ADAM	Contractor and Government	Moderate	yes	4/20/2007	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/26/2007	1/29/2008
Financial Data Warehouse	Government Only	Moderate	yes	9/15/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/25/2007	1/29/2008
ORBIT	Contractor and Government	Moderate	yes	8/24/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/22/2007	1/29/2008
Payroll Personnel and Labor	Contractor and Government	Moderate	yes	9/15/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/25/2007	6/10/2008
Travel Manager	Government Only	Moderate	yes	7/30/2008	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/19/2007	7/17/2008

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? Yes

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

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

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

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

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
Administrative Data Warehouse/ADAM	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
Cost Recovery and Imaging	Yes	No	This is a future planned system not yet in the acquisition phase	No	Because the system is not operational, the SORN is not yet required to be published
Financial Data Warehouse	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
Financial System Modernization Project	Yes	Yes	This system is in the acquisition phase and is not yet operational	No	Because the system is not operational, the SORN is not yet required to be published
ORBIT	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
Payroll Personnel and Labor	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	Yes	http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-01.htm
Travel Manager	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	Yes	http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-29.htm

Details for Text Options:
Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.

Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.

Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

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

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

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

   a. If "no," please explain why?

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

   a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. — Financial Replacement System (FinRS)

   b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? — No

   a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the 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)
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that allow the classification of data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Classification			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the removal of incorrect or unneccessary characters and data from a data source.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Cleansing			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the restoration and stabilization of data sets to a consistent, desired state.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Recovery			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the archiving and storage of large volumes of data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Warehouse			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the manipulation and change of data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Extraction and Transformation			No Reuse	1
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the population of a data source with external data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Loading and Archiving			No Reuse	1
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the maintenance and administration of data that describes data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Meta Data Management			No Reuse	1
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the organization of data from separate data sources into a single source using middleware or application integration and the modification of system data models to capture new information within a single system.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Data Integration			No Reuse	1
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the redesigning of disparate information systems into one system that uses a common set of data structures and rules.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Enterprise Application Integration			No Reuse	2
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the communication between newer generation hardware/software applications	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Legacy Integration			No Reuse	2

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)
	and the previous, major generation of hardware/software applications.							
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support a defined, specified set of finance-related tasks for a given objective.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Activity-Based Management			No Reuse	8
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the examination and verification of records for accuracy.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Auditing			No Reuse	8
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the charging, collection and reporting of an organization's accounts.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting			No Reuse	8
E-Gov: FMLoB Partner Contribution	Develop a common government-wide accounting code structure, including an applicable set of definitions and the layout, which federal agencies' new financial systems must adhere. Note - external reuse percentage rounds to zero.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting	Billing and Accounting	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	External	0
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of credit cards or electronic funds transfers for payment and collection of products or services.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Credit / Charge			No Reuse	8
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the calculations and difference between multiple mediums of exchange.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Currency Translation			No Reuse	1
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the process of accounts receivable.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Debt Collection			No Reuse	8
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the management and reimbursement of costs paid by employees or an organization.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Expense Management			No Reuse	8
FinRS	Defines the set	Back Office	Financial	Payment /			No Reuse	9

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	of capabilities that support the process of accounts payable.	Services	Management	Settlement				
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that involve the administration and determination of employees compensation.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Payroll			No Reuse	6
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the allocation and re-investment of earned net credit or capital within an organization.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Revenue Management			No Reuse	9
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support and analyze information and predict the impact of decisions before they are made.	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Decision Support and Planning			No Reuse	3
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of dynamic reports on an as needed basis.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	3
FinRS	Defines the set of capabilities that support the analysis of information that has been summarized into multidimensional views and hierarchies.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	OLAP			No Reuse	1
Portal/Extract; Transform and Load Tool (ETL) Tool (PETL)	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of pre-conceived or pre-written reports.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned	Extraction and Transformation	020-00-01-16-02-6029-00	Internal	1
E-Gov: FMLoB Partner Contribution	Develop performance measures (cost, quality, timeliness) to assess the performance of financial services offered by a financial service organization. Note - external reuse percentage rounds to zero.	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Performance Management	Performance Management	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	External	0
FinRS	Support the administration of a group of investments held by an organization.	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Portfolio Management			No Reuse	1
FinRS	Support the determination of long-term goals and the identification of the best approach for	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Strategic Planning and Mgmt			No Reuse	2

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)
	achieving those goals.							
E-Gov: FMLoB Partner Contribution	Develop standard business processes, data specifications and business rules for core financial management functions (e.g. funds management, payments, receipts and reporting) to be adopted by all federal agencies. Note - external reuse percentage rounds to zero.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Business Rule Management	Business Rule Management	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	External	0

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

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

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

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

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

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Activity-Based Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Business Rule Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Credit / Charge	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Currency Translation	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Expense Management	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Debt Collection	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Decision Support and Planning	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
OLAP	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Decision Support and Planning	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Auditing	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Billing and Accounting	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Payroll	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Revenue Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Strategic Planning and Mgmt	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Portfolio Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Data Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	

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

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
Data Classification	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Data Recovery	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Extraction and Transformation	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	
Meta Data Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Data Cleansing	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Legacy Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	

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

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

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

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

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

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

By supporting the FM LoB and other Presidential E-Government Strategic initiatives, FinRS is leveraging various components and applications across the government to accomplish its mission in the most efficient and effective manner.
EPA contributes approx. $45K annually to the government-wide FM LoB effort. In its new financial system implementation, EPA will reuse the following FSIO products:

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

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

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

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

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

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? 7/11/2008

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

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

2. Alternative Analysis Results: * Costs in millions
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Alternative 1 Shared Service Provider (SSP)	This alternative would implement a FSIO certified COTS application to replace most OCFO systems, leveraging a cross-servicing agreement with an OMB-identified SSP. The SSP would implement the financial system and be responsible for migrating EPA users from all legacy systems integrating the core system with other FinRS modules. The SSP would host EPA s core financial management system externally to EPA as defined by OMB s FM LoB. This alternative includes costs from both FinRS and LFS systems.	563.7	21.1
Alternative 2 Agency Hosted COTS solution	This alternative would implement a FSIO certified COTS application to replace most OCFO systems. As with Alternative One, an integrator would implement the COTS system and be responsible for migrating EPA users from all legacy systems. Instead of using a government SSP or commercial ASP, EPA would host COTS package in-house.	597.1	-12.2
Alternative 3 Legacy System Upgrade	This alternative would upgrade existing applications to provide some degree of compliance with identified functional deficiencies, as it would aim at mitigating financial system investment costs without the purchase of COTS. Consistent with the FM LoB, EPA would purchase hosting services for the new financial system and possibly other services from a SSP in either the public or private sector.	574.3	-17.4
Baseline	Status quo	484.5	0

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

Alternative 1 was chosen because it has the best combination of benefit, cost and risk. It has the highest Savings to Investment Ratio (SIR), 19%, and the second highest NPV, -$78.5M; Alternative 2 has a -7% SIR and a NPV of -$103.5M; while Alternative 3 had a -14% SIR and a NPV of -$76.9M. A comprehensive risk analysis determined that Alternative 1 has the lowest overall project risk, followed by Alternatives 2 and 3. This analysis is performed and updated annually.

a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.) Beyond 2021

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Improve Financial Performance
-Continue to align with FM LoB e-gov initiative
-Incorporate best practices through periodic FSIO-compliant updates/upgrades
-Meet existing laws and regulations
-Consolidate financial systems and core financial functionality
-Reengineer processes to meet core finance and payroll best business practices
-Produce not only quarterly but monthly financial statements

-Meet OMB and Treasury requirements more efficiently
-Consolidate debt collection functionality and follow debt collection best practices
-Automate time and attendance (T&A) processing resulting in less adjustments per month
-Reduce manual T&A processing resulting in less data entry errors and corrections
-Reduce the amount of EPA support for numerous cuff applications as they are replaced
-Route documents electronically between integrated systems

Improve Financial Service to the Customer
-Provide interoperability between agencies with XML
-Provide a single point of access to government services through the administrative data warehouse
-Consolidate financial functionality to minimize redundancy and maximize integration
-Provide robust editing, real-time data, reporting capabilities, web-accessibility, and a modern development environment
-Provide Business Intelligence tools for common services coupled with use of web-designed applications
-Enhance the ability to provide common, efficient administrative services
-Provide the ability to make payments of all kinds
-Provide the ability to manage funds on-line
-Support electronic business processes
-Automate payroll processes to reduce pay statement generation from 7 to 3 days
-Speed up the travel management process and achieve faster reimbursements

Maintain a Secure Financial Systems Environment
-Ensure a secure systems environment through the use of newer and more integrated technologies
-Provide the ability to integrate digital signatures for transactions

Improve Financial Accountability
-Maintain compliance with accounting standards and produce annual financial statements
-Institute cost management/accounting techniques to provide more timely and useful information for managing program resources

Improve Budget and Performance Integration
-Provide tailored budget formulation functionality
-Integrate financial and performance information
A number of these qualitative benefits will become quantitative benefits as FinRS components move from acquisition to development.

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY - 1 2007 & Prior	0	0		
PY 2008	3.8	0	Efficiencies gained through consolidation of data mart and data store hardware; more efficient time and labor processing	
CY 2009	4.3	0	Continued benefits from data mart and data store consolidation and time and labor processing efficiencies; deferred adaptive maintenance on the core financial system in anticipation of the new core financial system	
BY 2010	3.6	0	Continued benefits from data mart and data store consolidation and time and labor processing efficiencies; deferred adaptive maintenance on the core financial system in anticipation of the new core financial system	
Total LCC Benefit			LCC = Life-cycle Cost	

6. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole?

a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment?

b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

5b. List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 8/16/2006

b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? No

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

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

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

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

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

EPA identified and documented its overall risks in its Risk Management Plan. Other specific investment risks are reflected in the Life Cycle Cost Estimate (LCCE) as follows:

--Cost estimates for labor-specific activities such as planning, testing, implementation, and operations and maintenance are based upon either fixed price costs in the applicable contracts or actual costs for similar services EPA has received in the past
--Cost estimates for hardware and software are based upon established cost estimating relationships (CERs) or fixed price contracts
--Following OMB Circular A-94, the LCCE reflects appropriate growth and economic escalation factors to project realistic lifecycle costs in future years

EPA additionally accounted for risk in its life cycle cost estimate by analyzing the level of risk intrinsic in the implementation phases of the acquisition. EPA determined that the levels of risk and accompanying risk-adjustment factors are as follows for the specific phases of implementation:

--Start-up/Planning - low risk and potential for Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contracting - 5% adjustment to cost
--Product Acceptance - low risk and potential for FFP contracting - 5% adjustment to cost
--Implementation other than Budget Formulation- medium risk since most of the work is fixed price - 10% adjustment to cost
--Time and Materials (Budget Formulation) - high risk due to requirement to augment COTS system with current budget system functionality - 20-25% adjustment to cost
--Project Management Office (PMO) Contract Support and Contractor Support - low risk due to known nature of PMO work - 5% adjustment to cost

The impact of applying risk to each of these phases adds a contingency cost of approximately $8M to the project cost.

EPA mitigates Operations & Maintenance (O&M) risk through the adoption of firm-fixed price contracting for the majority of the services. EPA applied a 10% risk adjustment to O&M to account for the risk associated with significant system upgrades. This risk factor adds approximately $6M to O&M costs over the life cycle.

Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

EVM is required only on DME portions of investments. For mixed lifecycle investments, O&M milestones should still be included in the table (Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline). This table should accurately reflect the milestones in the initial baseline, as well as milestones in the current baseline.

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748? Yes

2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) No

a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?

b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:

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

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? Yes

a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? 6/30/2008

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	Planning: Acquisition	3/3/2004	$0.000000			$0.000000	$0.000000		$0.000000	0%
2	Planning: BPR	10/31/2003	$0.100000			$0.000000	$0.000000		$0.000000	0%
3	Planning: Implementation	5/18/2005	$1.600000			$0.000000	$0.000000		$0.000000	0%
4	Cost Rec & imaging: Acquisition	8/31/2006	$0.100000			$0.000000	$0.000000		$0.000000	0%
5	Cost Rec. & imaging: BPR	5/31/2006	$0.100000			$0.000000	$0.000000		$0.000000	0%
6	Cost Rec. & Imaging Implementation	12/31/2007	$1.600000			$0.000000	$0.000000		$0.000000	0%
7	Financial COTS: BPR	7/1/2004	$3.300000			$0.000000				0%
8	Financial COTS: Implementation	3/30/2007	$20.300000			$0.000000	$0.000000		$0.000000	0%
9	EAI: Implementation on Phase I	11/30/2004	$0.600000			$0.000000				0%
10	EAI: Implementation on Phase II	11/30/2005	$2.800000			$0.000000	$0.000000		$0.000000	0%
11	ADW: Acquisition	12/15/2004	$0.300000			$0.000000				0%
12	ADW: Implementation Phase I	12/31/2007	$4.600000			$0.000000				0%
13	ADW: Implementation Phase II	10/29/2004	$0.300000			$0.000000	$0.000000		$0.000000	0%
14	ADW: ORBIT phase I	11/30/2004	$2.800000			$0.000000				0%
15	ADW: ORBIT phase II	11/30/2005	$0.700000			$0.000000				0%
16	eTravel Migration	2/15/2004	$0.100000			$0.000000				0%
17	PPL Org, Change/BPR, System Build and Test, Implementation	9/30/2003	$13.400000			$0.000000				0%
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										

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			
24										
25	Financial System Modernization Project: Planning & Acquisition costs prior to FY 2008			9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$15.147000	$15.147000	0	$0.000000	100%
26	Financial System Modernization Project: Planning & Acquisition			9/30/2008		$6.207000	$3.050000		-$0.008570	49%
27	Financial System Modernization Project: Product Acceptance Test			9/30/2008		$2.103000	$0.158000		$0.010240	8%
28	Financial System Modernization Project: Implementation ("go live" 10/1/2010)			12/31/2010		$64.755000				0%
29										
30										
31										
32										
33										
34										
35										
36										
37	Warehousing & Reporting: System costs prior to FY 2008			9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$26.706000	$26.706000	0	$0.000000	100%
38	Warehousing & Reporting: Planning & Acquisition			9/30/2008		$0.368000	$0.338000		$0.000560	92%
39	Warehousing & Reporting: Implementation Phase I			4/30/2009		$5.714000				0%
40	Warehousing & Reporting: Implementation Phase II			9/30/2010		$7.790000				0%
41	Warehousing & Reporting: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance			9/30/2008		$4.701000	$3.231000		-$0.081330	67%

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			
42	Warehousing & Reporting: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance			9/30/2009		$4.920000				0%
43	Warehousing & Reporting: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance			9/30/2010		$4.933000				0%
44										
45										
46										
47										
48										
49										
50										
51										
52	eTravel Migration: Migration costs prior to FY 2008			9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$1.780000	$1.780000	0	$0.000000	100%
53	eTravel Migration: Testing and rollout			9/30/2008		$0.671000	$0.285000		-$0.003180	42%
54	PeoplePlus T&A: System costs prior to FY 2008			9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$18.691000	$18.691000	0	$0.000000	100%
55	PeoplePlus T&A: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance			9/30/2008		$2.652000	$1.447000		$0.329840	67%
56	PeoplePlus T&A: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance			9/30/2009		$2.506000				0%
57	PeoplePlus T&A: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance			9/30/2010		$2.561000				0%
58										

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			
59										
60										
61										
62										
63										
64										
65										
66	Travel Manager: System costs prior to FY 2008			9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$5.702000	$5.702000	0	$0.000000	100%
67	Travel Manager: Limited Operations & Maintenance during eTravel rollout			9/30/2008		$0.195000	$0.117000		$0.013650	67%
68	Travel Manager: Limited Operations & Maintenance until decommissioning			9/30/2009		$0.425000				0%
Project Totals										